# NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment---Without Compromise. | JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, Corresponding Editor.

VOLUME IX.---NO. 50. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1849. | WHOLE NUMBER 466.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

Terms.—Two dollars per annum; Strictly in advance in all cases.


## Selections.

### Slave Trade and Slavery in the District of Columbia.

SPEECH OF MR. HORACE MANN,
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
*In the House of Representatives, February* 23, 1849,
On Slavery and the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN said:

Mr. Chairman: There is a bill upon the Speaker's table which provides for abolishing the slave trade in the District of Columbia. For three successive days we have tried in vain to reach it, in the order of business. Its opponents have baffled our efforts. Our difficulty is not in carrying the bill, but in reaching it. I am not without apprehension that the last sands of this Congress will run out, without any action upon the subject. Even should the bill be taken up, it is probable that all debate upon it will be suppressed by that sovereign silencer,—the previous question. Hence I avail myself of the present opportunity, as it is probably the only one I shall have, during the present session, to submit my views upon it.

I frankly avow, in the outset, that the bill provides for one part only of an evil, whose remedy, as it seems to me, is not only the object of a reasonable desire, but of a rightful and legal demand. The bill proposes the abolition, not of Slavery, but only of the slave trade in the District of Columbia. My argument will go to show that within the limits of this District, Slavery ought not to exist in fact, and does not exist in law.

Sir, in the first place, let us inquire what is the state of things in this District on this subject. The gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. R. W. Thompson,] who addressed us a few days since, used the following language:

"What is the slave trade in the District of Columbia? I have heard a great deal said about 'slave pens,'—about slaves sold at auction,—and about stripping the mother from the child, and the husband from the wife. These things may exist here, but I do not know of them. Since I have been in the habit of visiting the District,—which is from my boyhood,—I have never seen a negro sold here,—I have never seen a band of negroes taken off by the slave trader. I do not remember that I have ever seen the slave trader himself. I know nothing of the 'slave pen' that is so much talked about. It may be here, however, and these things may happen every day before the eyes of gentlemen who choose to hunt them up, but for myself, I have no taste for such things."

Now sir, if the gentleman means to say that he has no personal knowledge of "slave pens" and of the slave traffic in that District, this is one thing; but if he means to deny or call in question the existence of the traffic itself, or of the deals where its concentrated inquities make up the daily employment of men, that is quite another thing. Sir, from the western front of this Capitol, from the piazza that opens out from your Congressional Library, as you cast your eye along the horizon and over the conspicuous objects of the landscape,—the President's Mansion, the Smithsonian Institution, and the site of the Washington Monument, you cannot fail to see the horrid and black receptacles where human beings are penned like cattle, and kept like cattle, that they may be sold like cattle,—as strictly and literally so as cows and swine are kept and sold at the Smithfield shambles in London, or at the cattle fair in Brighton. In a communication made during the last session, by the Mayor of this city, to an honorable member of this House, *he* acknowledges the existence of slave pens here. Up and down the beautiful river that sweeps along the western margin of the District, slavers come and go, bearing their freight of human souls to be vended in this market-place; and after they have changed hands, according to the forms of commerce, they are re-transported,—the father of a family to go, perhaps, to the rice fields of South Carolina, the mother to the cotton fields of Alabama, and the children to be scattered over the sugar plantations of Louisiana or Texas.

Sir, it is notorious that the slave traders of this District advertise for slaves in the newspapers of the neighbouring counties of Maryland, to be delivered in any numbers at their slave pens in this city; and that they have agents, in the city and out of it, who are engaged in supplying victims for their shambles. Since the gentleman from Indiana was elected to this Congress, and, I believe, since he took his seat in this Congress, one coffle of about sixty slaves came, chained and driven into this city: and at about the same time another coffle of a hundred. Here they were lodged for a short period, were then sold, and went on their returnless way to the engulfing south.

Sir, all this is done here under our own eyes, and within hearing of our own ears. All this is done now, and it has been done for fifty years,—ever since the seat of the National Government was established in this place, and ever since Congress, in accordance with the Constitution, has exercised "*exclusive* legislation" over it. But the gentleman from Indiana, though accustomed to visit this District from his boyhood, has "never seen a negro sold here;" he has "never seen a band of negroes taken off by the slave trader;" he "does not remember to have seen the slave trader himself;" he knows "nothing of the slave pen that is so much talked about." Sir, the eye sees, not less from the inner than from the outer light. The eye sees what the mind is disposed to recognize. The image upon the retina is nothing, if there be not an inward sense to discern it. The artist sees beauty; the philosopher sees relations of cause and effect; the benevolent man catches the slightest tone of sorrow; but the insensate heart can wade through tears and see no weeping, and can live amidst groans of anguish, and the air will be a non-conductor of the sound. I know a true anecdote of an American gentleman who walked through the streets of London with a British nobleman; and being beset at every step of the way by squalid mendicants, the American, at the end of the excursion, adverted to their having run a gauntlet between beggars. "What beggars?" said his lordship; "*I have seen none.*"

But the gentleman from Indiana says, "but for myself, I have no taste for such things." His taste explains his vision. Suppose Wilberforce and Clarkson had had no "taste" for quelling the horrors of the African slave trade. Suppose Howard and Mrs. Fry to have had no "taste" for laying open the abominations of the prison-house, and for giving relief to the prisoner. Suppose Miss Dix to have had no "taste" for carrying solace and comfort and restoration to the insane. Suppose the Abbe L'Eppe to have had no "taste" for teaching deaf mutes; or the Abbe Hauy for educating the blind; or M. Seguin and others for training idiots, and for educing docility and decency and a love of order from those almost imperceptible germs of reason and sense, that barely distinguish them from the brutes! Suppose these things, and in what a different condition would the charities and the sufferings of the world have been! Herod had no "taste" for sparing the lives of the children of Bethlehem, and of all the coasts thereof; and doubtless he could have said, with entire truth, that he never heard the voice, in Rama, of lamentation and weeping and great mourning; nor saw, among all the mothers of Syria, any Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted, because they were not. But, sir, just in proportion as the light of civilization and Christianity dawns upon the world, will men be found who have a "taste for succouring the afflicted and for righting the wronged. It was the clearest proof of the Great Teacher's mission, that he had "a taste" for going about, doing good.

During the last fifty years, and especially during the last half of these fifty years, the world has made great advances in the principles of liberty. Human rights have been recognized, and their practical enjoyment, to some extent, secured. There is not a Government in Europe, even the most iron and despotical of them all, that has not participated in the ameliorations which characterize the present age. A noble catalogue of rights has been wrested by the British Commons from the British nobility. France and Italy have been revolutionized. Even the Pope of Rome, whose power seemed as eternal as the hills on which he was seated, has sunk under the shock. Prussia, and all the Germanic Powers, with the exception of Austria, have been half revolutionized; and even the icy despotisms of Austria and Russia are forced to relent under those central fires of liberty which burn forever in the human heart, as the central fires of the earth burn forever at its core. Great Britain has abolished African Slavery throughout all her realms. France has declared that any one who shall voluntarily become the owner of a slave, or shall voluntarily continue to be the owner of a slave cast upon him by bequest or inheritance, shall cease to be a citizen of France. Denmark has abolished Slavery wherever it existed in her possessions. The Bey of Tunis, acting under the light of the Mohammedan religion, has abolished it. The priests of Persia declare the sentiment to have come by tradition from Mohammed himself, "that the worst of men is the seller of men." Not only all civilized nations, but the half-civilized, the semi-barbarous, are acting under the guidance of the clearer light and the higher motives of our day. But there is one conspicuous exception; there is one Government which closes its eyes to this increasing light; which resists the persuasion of these ennobling motives; which, on the grand subject of human liberty and human rights, is stationary and even retrogades, while the whole world around is advancing; sleeps while all others are awaking; loves its darkness while all others are aspiring and ascending to a purer air and a brighter sky. This Goverament, too, is the one which is the most boastful and vainglorious of its freedom; and, if the humiliating truth must be spoken, this Government is our own. In regard to Slavery and the slave trade in this District, where we possess the power of exclusive legislation, we stand where we stood fifty years ago. Not a single ameliorating law has been passed. In practice, we are where we were then; in spirit, there are proofs that we have gone backward.

There are now on the surface of the globe two conspicuous places,—places which are attracting the gaze of the whole civilized world,—whither men and women are brought from great distances to be sold, and whence they are carried to great distances to suffer the heaviest wrongs that human nature can bear. One of these places is the coast of Africa, which is among the most pagan and benighted regions of the earth; the other is the District of Columbia, the capital and seat of Government of the United States.

As far back as 1808 Congress did what it could to abolish the slave trade on the coast of Africa. In 1820 it declared the foreign slave trade to be piracy; but on the 31st of January, 1849, a bill was introduced into this House to abolish the domestic slave trade in this District,—here, in the centre and heart of the nation,—and seventy-two Representatives voted against it,—voted to lay it on the table, where, as we all know, it would sleep a dreamless sleep. This was in the House of Representatives. It is well known that the Senate is still more resistant of progress than the House; and it is the opinion of many that even if a bill should pass both House and Senate, it would receive the Executive veto. By authority of Congress, the city of Washington is the Congo of America.

But, still more degrading than this, there is another contrast which we present to the whole civilized world. The very slaves upon whom we have trodden have risen above us, and their moral superiority makes our conduct ignominious. Not Europeans only, not only Arabians and Turks, are emerging from the inhumanity and the enormities of the slave traffic; but even our own slaves, transplanted to the land of their fathers, are raising barriers against the spread of this execrable commerce. On the shores of Africa, a republic is springing up, whose inhabitants were transplanted from this Egypt of bondage. And now look at that government which these slaves and descendants of slaves have established, and contrast it with our own. They discard the institution of Slavery, while we cherish it. A far greater proportion of their children than of the white children of the slave States of this Union, are at school. In the metropolis of their nation, their flag does not protect the slave traffic, nor wave over the slave mart. Would to God that the very opposite of this were not true of our own. Their laws punish the merchandise of human beings; our laws sanction and encourage it. They have erected, and are erecting, fortifications and military posts along the shores of the Atlantic, for seven hundred miles to prevent pirates from invading the domain of their neighbours, and kidnapping people who, to them, are foreign nations. We open market-places here, at the centre of the nation, where, from seven hundred miles of coast, the sellers may come to sell, and where the buyers may come to buy, and whence slaves are carried almost as far from their birth-place as Africa is from America. The Governor of Liberia has lately made a voyage to England and France, and entered into treaties of amity and commerce with them; and he has obtained naval forces from them, to abolish this traffic in human beings. At the same time we are affording guaranties to the same traffic. Virginia and Maryland are to the Slave Trade what the interior of Africa once was. The Potomac and the Chesapeake are the American Niger and Bight of Benin; while this District is the great Government barracoon, whence coffles are driven across the country to Alabama or Texas, as slave ships once bore their dreadful cargoes of agony and woe across the Atlantic. The very race, then, which were first stolen, brought to this country, despoiled of all the rights which God had given them, kept in bondage for generations, at last, after redeeming themselves; or being restored to their natural liberty in some other way, have crossed the ocean, established a government for themselves, and are now setting us an example which should cause our cheeks to blister with shame.

Sir, there is an idea often introduced here and elsewhere, and made to bear against any restriction of Slavery, or any amelioration of the condition of the slave, which I wish to consider. It was brought odiously and prominently forward the other day, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Charles Brown.) The idea is, that the slaves are in a better condition in this country than they would have been at home. It is affirmed that they are brought under some degree of civilizing and humanizing influences amongst us, which they would not have felt in the land of their fathers.

Let us look, first, at the philosophy of this notion, and then at its morality. All those who use this argument as a defence or a mitigation of the evils of Slavery, or as a *final cause* for its existence, *assume* that if the present three million slaves who now darken our southern horizon, and fill the air with their groans, had not been here in their present state of bondage, they would have been in Africa, in a state of paganism. Now, the slightest reflection shows that this assumption has no basis of truth. Not one of them all would now have been in existence, if their ancestors had not been brought to this country. And, according to the laws of population operative among barbarous nations, there are now just as many inhabitants,—pagans, cannibals, or what you please,—in Africa, as there would have been if the spoiler had never entered their home, and ravished and borne them into bondage. Among savage nations, or nomadic tribes, the population equals the means of subsistence. Take away two, three, or four per cent. of the consumers, and the vacuum is immediately supplied. The population keeps up to the level of the production. Among such people, there is always a tendency to increase faster than the means of living increase. Take away a part of them, and this tendency to increase takes effect by its own vigour, it executes itself. It is like a bow that unbends, or a spring that uncoils, as soon as an external pressure is removed. Dam up a fountain, and the weight of the accumulating strata will eventually check the outflow from the spring. So it is of a savage population. Of them the Malthusian theory is true.

And how infinitely absurd and ridiculous is the plea that the slaves are better off here *than* THEY *would have been in Africa!* Go out into the streets of this city, and take the first one you meet,—perhaps he is a mulatto. But for being here, he would have been a mulatto in the middle of Africa, would he? Take them all,—mulatto, mestizo, zambo, and all "the vast variety of man," so far as colour is concerned,—and if they had not their existence here, they would have had it in Africa! This is the doctrine. Would they have had the same American names also? Would they have spoken the same language, and worn cotton grown on the same fields? The last is just as certain as the first. It is all more silly than the repinings of the silly girls who grieved because their mother had not married a certain rich suitor, whose addresses in early life she had rejected; for then, said they, how rich we should have been! No, not one of these three millions of men, women and children, would have been in existence in Africa. All the crime of their kidnapping; all the horrors of the middle passage; all their sufferings for two centuries, or six generations; and all the calamities that are yet to grow out of their condition,—all these crimes and agonies are gratuitous crimes and agonies. There is no recompense or palliation for them. They have been added unnecessarily and remorselessly to the amount of human guilt and suffering for which the white race must answer in the day of account. The idea, then, of sending the slaves back to *their* country is an egregious fallacy. If they were to be sent *back* whence they came, it would not be to Africa, but to nonentity.

If the ancestors of the present three millions of slaves had never been brought here,—if their descendants had never been propagated here, for the supposed value of their services, their places would have been supplied by white labourers, by men of the Caucasian race,—by freemen. Instead of the three million slaves, of all colours, we should doubtless now have at least three million white, free-born citizens, adding to the real prosperity of the country, and to the power of the Republic. If the South had not had slaves to do their work for them, they would have become ingenious and inventive like the North, and would have enlisted the vast forces of nature in their service,—wind and fire and water and steam and lightning, the mighty energies of gravitation and the subtle forces of chemistry. The country might not have had so gaudy and ostentious a civilization as at present, but it would have had one infinitely more pure and sound.

But admit the alleged statement, absurd and false as is is; admit that these three millions of slaves would have belonged to Africa if they had not belonged to America,—that they would have been born of the same fathers and mothers there as here, so that those of them who are American mulattoes would have been Ethiopian mulattoes; and admit, further, that their present condition is better than the alternative condition alleged,—and what then? Is your duty done? Is it enough if you have made the condition of a man or of a race a little better; or any better, if you have not made it as much better as you can? What standard of morals do gentlemen propose to themselves? If a fellow-being is suffering under a hundred diseases, and we can relieve him from them all, what kind of benevolence is that which boasts of relieving him from one, and permits him to suffer under the other ninety-and-nine? By the law of nature and of God, the slave like every other man, is entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; he is entitled to his earnings,—to the enjoyment of his social affections,—to the development of his intellectual and moral faculties,—to that cultivation of his religious nature which shall fit him, not merely to feel, but reason of righteousness, temperance, and a judgment to come;—he is entitled to all these rights, of which he has been cruelly despoiled; and when he catches some feeble glimmering of some of them, we withhold the rest, and defend ourselves and pride ourselves that he is better off than he would have been in some other country, or in some other condition. Suppose the Samaritan had bound up a single wound, or relieved a single pang of the bleeding wayfarer who had fallen among thieves, and then had gone to the next inn and boasted of his benevolence. He would only have shown the difference between a "good Samaritan" and a "bigot Samaritan." The thieves themselves might have done as much.

But there is another inquiry which the champions of Slavery have got to answer before the world and before Heaven. If American slaves are better off than native Africans, who is to be thanked for it? Has their improved condition resulted from any purposed plan, any well-digested, systematized measure, carefully thought out, and reasoned out, and intended for their benefit? Not at all. In all the Southern statute books, and legislative records there is no trace of any such scheme. Laws, judicial decisions, the writings of political economists—all treat the slave as a thing to make money with. Agricultural societies give rewards for the best crops. Horse-jockey societies improve the fleetness of the breed for the sports of the turf. Even the dogs have professional trainers. But not one thing is done to bring out the qualities of manhood that lie buried in a slave. Look through the Southern statute books and see what Draconian penalties are inflicted for teaching a slave to read,—see how he is lashed for attending a meeting to hear the word of God. On every highroad patrols lie in wait to scourge him back, if he attempts to visit father, mother, wife, child, or friend, on a neighbouring plantation. By day and by night, at all times and everywhere, he is the victim of an energetic and comprehensive system of measures, which blot out his senses, paralyze his mind, degrade and brutify his nature, and suppress the instinctive workings of truth, generosity, and manhood in his breast. All the good that reaches him in defiance of these privations and disabilities. If any light penetrates to his soul, it is because human art cannot weave a cloud dense and dark enough to be wholly impervious to it. There are some blessings which the goodness of God will bestow in spite of human efforts to intercept them. It is these only which reach the slave. And after having built up all barriers to forbid the access of improvement; after having sealed his senses by ignorance, and more than half obliterated his faculties by neglect and perversion, the oppressor turns round, and because there are some scanty, incidental benefits growing out of the very deplorableness of his condition, he justifies himself before the world and claims the approval of Heaven, because the slave is better off here than *he* would be in Africa. Sir, such an argument as this is would be an offence to Heaven. I consider it to be as much worse than Atheism as Christianity is better. And when such an argument comes from a gentleman belonging to a free State: when it comes from the gentleman from Pensylvania, (Mr. Brown,) from a representative of the city of William Penn; when he, without motive, without inducement, offers such a sacrifice to the devil, I can account for it only on the principle of the man who, having a keen relish for the flesh of swine, said he wished he were a Jew, that he might have the pleasure of eating pork and committing a sin at the same time.

But the subject presents a still more painful aspect. How are slaves made better, and from what motives are they made better, in this country? It is no secret that I am about to tell. There are certain virtues and sanctities which increase the pecuniary value of certain slaves; and there are certain vices and debasements which increase the market price of others. If a master wishes to repose personal confidence in his slave, he desires to have him honest and faithful to truth. But if he desires to make use of him to deceive and cajole and defraud, then he wishes to make him cunning and tricky and false. If the master trains the slave to take care of his own children, or of his favourite animals, then he wishes to have him kind; but if he trains him for a tasker or a field overseer, then he wishes to have him severe. Now, it is in this way that some of the Christian attributes of character, being directly convertible into money or money's worth, enhance the value of a slave. Hence, it is said in advertisements that a slave is pious, and, at the auction-block, the hardened and heartless seller dwells upon the Christian graces and religious character of some slave, with the unction of an Apostle. The purchaser sympathizes, and only desires to know whether the article be a real or a sham Christian. If mere bones and muscles compacted into human shape be worth five hundred dollars, then, if the auctioneer can warrant the subject to have the meekness of Moses and the patience of Job, the same article may be worth seven hundred. If the slave will forgive injuries not merely seventy times seven, but injuries inflicted all his life long, then an additional hundred may be bid for him. If he possesses all the attributes of religion and piety, the endurance of a hero, the constancy of a saint, the firmness of a martyr, the trustingness of a disciple,—all except those which go to make him feel like a man,—then that which as mere bone and muscle was worth five hundred dollars, is now worth a thousand. Sir, is not this selling the Holy Spirit! Is not this making merchandise of the Saviour? Is not this the case of Judas selling his Master over again, with the important exception of the remorse that made the original culprit go and hang himself? But suppose the case to be that of a woman; suppose her ability to work and capacity for production to be worth five hundred dollars; suppose, in addition to this, she is young and sprightly and voluptuous; suppose the repeated infusion of Saxon blood has almost washed the darkness from her skin; and suppose she is not unwilling to submit herself to the libertine's embrace; then, too, that which before was worth but five hundred dollars, will now bring a thousand. And thus infernal as well as celestial qualities are coined into money, according to the demands of the market and the uses of the purchaser.

Now, it is only in some such incidental way, and with regard to some individuals, that it can be said, that their condition is better here than it would be in Africa. And this improvement, where it exists, is not the result of any system of measures designed for their benefit, but is the product of selfish motives, turning godliness into gain; and where more gain or more gratification can be obtained by the debasement, the irreligion, the pollution of the slave, there the instincts of chastity, the sanctity of the marriage relation, the holiness of maternal love, are all profaned to give security and zest to the guilty pleasures of the sensualist and debauchee. There are individual exceptions to what I have said,—exceptions, which amid surrounding iniquity shine "like a jewel in an Ethiop's ear," but they are exceptions. Laws, institutions, and the prevailing public sentiment are as I have described.

I regard the argument, therefore, of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Brown) not only as utterly unsound and false in its premises, but as blasphemous in its conclusions. Common blasphemy seldom reaches beyond exclamation. It is some fiery outburst of impious passion, that flashes and expires. But the gentleman reasons it out coolly. His is argumentative blasphemy, borrowing the forms of logic that it may appear to have its force, and transferring it from the passions to the intellect, to give it permanency.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania retorts upon Massachusetts, and refers to certain things in her history which he regards as disreputable to her. In this, he has been followed by the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Bedinger,) who has poured out a torrent of abuse upon my native State, and who has attempted to fortify his own intemperate accusations from a Pro-Slavery pamphlet which has been profusely scattered about this House within a few days past, and which is not merely full of falsehoods, but is composed of falsehoods; so that if one were to take the false assertions and the false arguments out of it, there would be nothing but the covers left.* Sir, I am very far from arrogating for Massachusetts all the merits and the virtues which she ought to possess. I mourn over her errors, and would die to reform, rather than spend one breath to defend them. The recital of her offences can fall more sadly upon no ear than upon my own. But it is as true of a State as of an individual, that repentance is the first step towards reformation. Massachusetts has committed errors; but when they were seen to be errors, she discarded them. She once held slaves; but when she saw that Slavery was contrary to the rights of man and to the law of God, she emancipated them. She was the first government in the world, ancient or modern,—to abolish Slavery wherever she had power to do so. This is an honour that no rival can ever snatch from her brow. Once, I say it with humiliation,—she was engaged in the Slave Trade. But all the gold that could be earned by the accursed traffic, though spent in the splendours of luxury and the seductions of hospitality, could not save the trader himself from infamy and scorn; and I am sure I am right in saying that the Slave Trade ceased to be conducted by Massachusetts merchants and to be carried on in Massachusetts ships, from Massachusetts ports, before it was abandoned by the merchants and discontinued in the ships and from the ports of any other commercial State or nation in the world. This, too, is an honour, which it will be hers, through all the immortality of the ages, alone to wear. But Massachusetts, it is still said, has her idolaters of Mammon in other forms. It is charged upon her that many of her children still wallow in the sty of intemperance; that her spiritualism runs wild in religious vagaries; and that something of the old leaven of persecution still clings to her heart. In vindicating what is right, I will not defend what is wrong. I cannot deny,—would to God that I could—that we still have vices and vicious men amongst us. There are those there, as elsewhere, who if they were to hear for the first time of the River of Life flowing fast by the throne of God, would instinctively ask, whether there were any millsites on it. There are those there, as elsewhere, whose highest aspirations for Heaven and for happiness, whether for this life or for another, are a distillery and a sugar-house, with steam machinery to mix the products. There, as elsewhere, are religionists who are quick to imitate the Saviour when he strikes, but despise his example when he heals.

But sir, let me say this for Massachusetts, that whatever sins she has committed in former times—whatever dissenters she may have persecuted, or witches she may have hanged, or Africans she may have stolen and sold, she has long since abandoned these offences, and is bringing forth fruits meet for repentance. And is a State to have no benefit from a statute of limitations? Is a crime committed by ancestors to be for ever imputed to their posterity? This is worse than non-forgiveness; it is making punishment hereditary. Sir, of these offences, Massachusetts has repented and reformed; and she is giving that noblest of atonements or expiations, which consists in repairing the wrong that has been done; and where the victim of the wrong has himself passed away, and is beyond relief, then in paying, with large interest, the debt to humanity, which the special creditor is no longer present to receive, by seeking out the objects of want and suffering, wherever they may be found. Sir, our accusers unconsciously do us the highest honor, when, in their zeal to malign us, they seek for historical reproaches. If they could find present offences wherewith to upbraid us, they would not exhume the past. But they condemn themselves, for they show that even the resuscitation of the errors of the dead gives them more pleasure than a contemplation of the virtues of the living. One thing is certain, the moment the other States shall imitate our present example, they will cease to condemn us for past offences. The sympathy for a common desire for improvement will destroy the pleasure of crimination.

And where, I ask, on the surface of the earth, is there a population of only eight hundred thousand, who are striving so earnestly, and doing so much to advance the cause of humanity and civilization, as is doing by the people of Massachusetts? Where else, where universal suffrage is allowed, is a million of dollars voted every year, by the very men who have to pay it, for the public, free education, to every child in the State? Where else, by such a limited population, is another million of dollars voted, and paid each year, for the salaries of clergymen alone? Where else, where the population is so small, and natural resources so few and scanty, is still another million of dollars annually given in charity?—the greater portion of which is sent beyond their own borders, flows into every State of the Union, and leaves not a nation on the globe, nor an island in the sea unwatered by its fertilizing streams. Look into the poor-book of Massachusetts, for the last twenty years, and you will see how the whole current of her legislation has set in the direction of human improvement—for succoring disease or restoration from it, for supplying the privations of nature, for reclaiming the vicious, for elevating all—a comprehensiveness of scope that takes in every human being, and an energy of action that follows every individual with a blessing to his home. When others will abandon their offences, then let the remembrance of them be blotted out.

But, sir, I think it proper to advert to the fact, that I have had other proofs, during the present session of Congress, of the same spirit of crimination and obloquy, which was so fully developed in the speeches of the gentleman from Pensylvania (Mr. Brown) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Redinger). Through the post-office of the House of Representatives, I have been in the regular receipt of anonymous letters, made up mainly of small slips cut from newspapers printed at the North, describing some case of murder, suicide, robbery, or other offence. These have been arranged under the heads of different States—Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, &c., and accompanied, in the margin, with rude drawings of a schoolbook or a school-house, and all referred to common schools, as to their source. Two only, of the whole number thus collected, originated in Massachusetts, and one of these was a case of suicide, committed by a man who had become insane from the loss of his wife. Which of these events, in the opinion of my anonymous correspondent, constituted the crime—whether the bereavement that caused the insanity, or the suicide committed in one of its paroxysms—I am unable to say. Now, what satisfaction even a man could have in referring offences against law and morality to the institution of public schools, when he must have known that the very existence of the offences only proves that education has not yet done its perfect work, I cannot conceive. And what spite, either against an educational office which I once held, or against an institution which is worthy of all honor, could be so mean and paltry as to derive gratification from referring me to long lists of offences, only one of which was committed in my native State, I must leave for others to conjecture. Surely the author of these letters must have known little of common schools, and profited by them as little as he has known. Had he referred to any considerable number of crimes perpetrated in Massachusetts, I would take his letters home, and carry them into our public schools, and make them the text for a sermon, in which I would warn the children to beware of all crimes, and especially of the meanness and wickedness which feels a complacency in the crimes of others, or can give a false paternity to them. And, sir, I should be sure of a response, for out of those schools there is going forth a nobler band of young men and women than ever before conveyed intelligence, virtue, refinement, and renown, upon any people or community on the face of the globe.

But whatever may be said in mitigation or in condemnation of Slavery elsewhere, there are special reasons why it should be discontinued in this District. This District is the common property of the nation. Having power of exclusive legislation over it, we are all responsible for the institutions in it. While slaves exist in it, therefore, it can be charged upon the North that they uphold Slavery. This is unjust to us, because it places us before the world in the attitude of sustaining what we condemn. It wounds our moral and religious sensibilities, because we believe the institution to be cruel towards men, and sinful in the sight of Heaven; and yet we are made apparently to sanction it. It is like that species of injustice where a man is compelled by a tax to support a religion which he disbelieves, and to pay a hierarchy whom his conscience compels him to denounce. But the existence of Slavery here is not necessary to the faith or the practice of our Southern brethren. If they believe it to be a useful and justifiable institution, then they evince the sincerity of that belief by sustaining and perpetuating it at home. For this purpose, there is no necessity, of a crusade to propagate it, or sustain it elsewhere.

Look at the relation which we bear to it, in another respect. I have been taught from my earliest childhood that "all men are created equal." This has become in me not merely a conviction of the understanding, but a sentiment of the heart. This maxim is my principle of action, whenever I am called upon to act; and it rises spontaneously to my contemplations when I speculate upon human duty. It is the plainest corollary from the doctrine of the natural equality of man, that when I see a man, or a class of men, who are not equal to myself in opportunities, in gifts, in means of improvement, or in motives and incitements to an elevated character and an exemplary life,—I say, it is the plainest corollary, that I should desire to elevate those men to an equality with myself. However far my own life may fall below the standard of Christianity and gentlemanliness, yet I hold it to be clear, that no man is a Christian or a gentleman, who does not carry about an habitual frame of mind which prompts him, as far as he has the means to do it, to instruct all the ignorance, to relieve all the privations, to minister to all the pains, and to supply all the deficiencies of those with whom he meets in the daily walks of life; and, so far as he is a man who wields influence, possesses authority, or exercises legislative power, he is bound to exert his gifts and his prerogatives for the amelioration and the improvement of his fellow-men. This is the lowest standard of duty that any one who aspires to be a Christian or a gentleman can set up for his guidance. Now take the case of a man from the North, who has incorporated these views or any similitude of these views, into his character, and who has occasion to visit this District. Suppose him to be elected and sent here as a member of Congress, or to be appointed to a post in some of the departments, or to visit this city on public business, or to come here from motives of curiosity; what is the sight which is inflicted upon him when he first sets his foot within this common property of the nation,—when he first enters this household, where the head of the nation resides and directs? Sir, when he first alights from the cars that bring him within your limits and your jurisdiction, he beholds a degraded caste,—a race of men whom God endowed with the faculties of intelligence, but whom man has despoiled of the power of improving those faculties, squalid in their garb, betraying ignorance in every word they utter, uncultivated in their manners and their tastes, fawning for a favor, instead of standing erect like men who are conscious of rights; or, if they have outgrown servile and sycophantic habits, then erring on the side of impudence and insolence as much as they erred before on that of cringing and servility. He repairs to his lodgings, and there, too, all his moral sensibilities are shocked and outraged, by seeing a class of men and women hopelessly degraded, cut off by law and custom from all opportunity of emerging from their debasement; whom no talent, taste, or virtue can ever redeem to the pleasures and the rights of social intercourse. He sees men and women who are not degraded on account of the services they perform,—for "honor and shame from no condition rise,"—but degraded by the motive and spirit from which the services are performed; men and women who have no inducements to industry and frugality, for their earnings will all be seized by another; who have no incentives to self-respect, for they can never emerge from their mental condition; who are bereaved of all the wonders and glories of knowledge, lest under its expansions their natures should burst the thraldom that enslaves them; and all whose manly qualities, all whose higher faculties, therefore, are irredeemably and hopelessly crushed, extinguished, obliterated, so that nothing but the animal, which the master can use for his selfish purposes, remains.

Mr. Brodhead. would you advance the slaves to an equal social and political condition with the white race?

Mr. Mann. I would give to every human being the best opportunity I could to develop and cultivate the faculties which God has bestowed upon him, and which, therefore, he holds under a divine charter. I would take from his neck the heel that has trodden him down; I would dispel from his mind the cloud that has shrouded him in moral night: I would remove the obstructions that have forbidden his soul to aspire; and having done this, I would leave him, as I would leave every other man, to find his level,—to occupy the position to which he should be entitled by his intelligence and his virtues. I entertain no fears on the much-dreaded subject of amalgamation. Legal amalgamation between the races will never take place, unless, in the changed condition of society, reasons shall exist to warrant and sanction it; and in that case it will carry its own justification with it. But one thing I could never understand,—why those who are so horror-stricken at the idea of *theoretic* amalgamation, should exhibit to the world, in all their cities, on all their plantations, and in all their households, such numberless proofs of *practical* amalgamation. I never could see why those who arraign and condemn us at the North, so vehemently, because, as they say, we obtrude our prying eyes into what they call a "domestic" or "fireside" institution, should have no hesitation in exhibiting to the world, through all their borders, ten thousand and ten times ten thousand living witnesses that they make it a bedside institution. Multitudes of the slaves of the South bear about upon their persons a brand as indelible as that of Cain; but the mark has been fastened upon them, not for their own crimes but for their fathers. In the complexion of the slave, we read the horrid history of the guilt of the enslavers. They demonstrate that the one race has been to the other, not the object of benevolence, but the victim of licentiousness.

But to resume: When the visitor to this city from the North leaves his lodgings, and goes into the public streets, half the people whom he meets there are of the same degraded class. Their tattered dress and unseemly manners denote congenital debasement. Their language proclaims their ignorance. If you have occasion to send them on an errand, they cannot read the direction of a note, or a sign on a shop-board. Their ideas are limited within the narrowest range. They speak the natural language of servility, and they wear the livery of an inferior condition. The conviction of their deplorable state is perpetually forced upon the mind. You do not need their colour to remind you of their degradation. Colour, sir! They are oftentimes almost as white as ourselves. Sir, there is not a member of Congress who has not frequently seen some of his fellow-members, in the spring of the year, with a jaundiced skin more sallow and more yellow than that of many a slave who is bought and sold and owned in this city. I have seen members of this House to whom I have been disposed to give a friendly caution to keep their "free papers" about their persons, lest suddenly, on the presumption from colour, they should be seized and sold for runaway slaves. A yellow complexion here is so common a badge of Slavery, that one whose skin is coloured by disease is by no means out of danger. To enjoy security, a man must do more than take care of his life; he must take care of his health. It is not enough to take heed to the meditations of his heart; he must see also to the secretions of his liver.

But, sir, the stranger from the North visits the courts of justice in this city; he goes into halls set apart and consecrated, even in the dark and half-heathenish periods of English history, to the investigation of truth and the administration of justice; but if he sees any specimens of the coloured race there, he sees them only as menials. They cannot go there as witnesses. However atrocious the wrongs they may suffer in their own person and character, or in the person and character of wife or children, they cannot appeal to the courts to avenge or redress them. If introduced there at all, it is as a bale of goods introduced, or as an ox, or a horse is brought within their purlieus, for the purpose of trying some disputed question of identity or ownership. They go not as suitors, but as sacrifices. In the courts of law; in the temples with which all our ideas of justice, of right between man and man, are associated; where truth goes to be vindicated, where innocence flies to be avenged;—in these courts, an entire portion of the human race are known, not as men, but as chattels, as cattle. Where, for them, is the Magna Charta, that the old barons wrested from King John? Is a whole race to be forever doomed to this outlawry? Are they forever to wear a "wolf's-head," which every white man may cut off when he pleases? Sir, it cannot be that this state of things will last forever. If all the rights of the black race are thus withheld from them, it is just as certain as the progress of time that they, too, will have their Runnymede, their Declaration of Independence, their Bunker Hill, and their Yorktown.

Such, sir, are the sights that molest us when we come here from the North,—that molest us in the hotels, that molest us in the streets, that molest us in the courts, that molest us everywhere. But the week passes away, and the Sabbath comes,—the day of rest from worldly toils, the day set apart for social worship, when men come together, and by their mutual presence and assistance, lift up the hearts of each other in gratitude to God. But where now are the coloured population, that seemed to be so numerous everywhere else? Have they no God?—Have they no interest in a Saviour's example and precepts? Have they no need of consolation, of faith in the Unseen, to help them bear up under the burdens and anxieties of life? Is their futurity so uncertain or so worthless that they need no guide to a better country, or that they can be turned off with a guide as ignorant and blind as themselves?

We go from the courts and the churches to the schools. But no child in whose skin there is a shadow of a shade of African complexion is to be found there. The channels are so cut that all the sacred and healing waters of knowledge flow, not to him, but by him. Sir, of all the remorseless and wanton cruelties ever committed in this world of wickedness and woe, I hold that to be the most remorseless and wanton which shuts out from all the means of instruction a being whom God has endued with the capacities of knowledge, and inspired with the divine desire *to know*. Strike blossom and beauty from the vernal season of the year, and leave it sombre and cheerless; annihilate the harmonies with which the birds of spring make vocal the field and the forest, and let exulting Nature become silent and desolate; dry up even those fountains of joy and gladsomeness that flow unbidden from the heart of childhood, and let the radient countenance of youth become dull and stony like that of age; do all this, if you will, but withhold your profane hand from those creative sources of knowledge which shall give ever renewing and ever-increasing delight through all the cycles of immortality, and which have the power to assimilate the finite creature more and more nearly to the infinite Creator. Sir, he who denies to children the acquisition of knowledge works devilish miracles. If a man destroys my power of hearing, it is precisely the same to me as though leaving my faculty of hearing untouched, he had annihilated all the melodies and harmonies of the universe. If a man obliterates my power of vision, it is precisely the same to me as though he had blotted out the light of the sun, and flung a pall of darkness over all the beauties of the earth and the glorious of the firmament. So, if a usurper of human rights takes away from a child the faculties of knowledge, or the means and opportunities to know, it is precisely the same to that child as though all the beauties and the wonders, all the magnificence and the glory of the universe itself had been destroyed. To one who is permitted to know nothing of the charms and sublimities of science, all science is non-existent. To one who is permitted to know nothing of the historical past, all the past generations of men are a non-ent

we at the North see a principle which prompts us and will prompt us, until the work is accomplished, to renewed exertions. On the same ground on which slavery in this District has been defended for the last fifty years, it can be defended for the next fifty, or the next five hundred years; it can be defended for ever. This idea of perpetual slavery in the very household of a republic of freemen, is not to be tolerated, and cannot be tolerated. But I will not dwell on this topic further. I close this branch of my argument with a proposition which seems to me but fair and equitable. The South has held this metropolis as a slave capital for fifty years. Let it now be held as a free capital for fifty years; and if, at the end of this period, adequate reasons can be shown, before any nation, civilized or uncivilized upon the face of the earth, for restoring it to slavery again, I for one, should have no fears of entering into an engagement upon such a condition, that it should again become "a land of Egypt and a house of bondage."

Notwithstanding I have dwelt so long upon the social and moral aspects of this subject, I am still tempted not to forego that which was my principal object in rising, namely, to submit an argument on the question of the legality or constitutionality of slavery in this District. I have bestowed much careful attention upon this subject, with the sincerest desire of arriving at true, legal, and constitutional results. I submit my views with deference, because I know they are in conflict with the views of others for whose knowledge and abilities I have the profoundest respect.

The legality of slavery in the District of Columbia has been assumed, and practically acquiesed in, for fifty years. Had the question of its validity been raised, and argued on the principles of the Constitution, immediately after the creation of the District, I believe this territory would have been declared free soil. In my conscientious opinion, slavery exists in this District only by original usurpation and subsequent acquiescence. If, so, Congress cannot be too speedily invoked to abdicate the power it has usurped.

The first position I take is this, THAT SLAVERY HAS NO LEGAL EXISTENCE, UNLESS BY FORCE OF POSITIVE LAW.

If any man claims authority over the body, mind and soul of one of his fellow-men, and claims this authority not only for the whole life of his victim, but a like authority over all his descendants, there is no part of the civilized world where he will not be required to show some positive law, authorising the power and the bondage. If the claimant says, "I am stronger, or I am wiser than he;" or "I have an Anglo-Saxon brain, while he has only an African brain;" or "my skin is white and his skin is not white;" or "I descended from Shem and he from Ham; and, therefore he is my slave,"—there is not a court in Christendom, which, though it may admit the fact, will ratify the inference. If the claimant affirms that it is *morally* right for him to seize his fellowman and reduce him to slavery; if he brings the Bible into court as his law-book, and cites Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Paul, as his authorities; still, I say, there is not a court in Christendom that will not deny the validity of the title, and rebuke the arrogance of the demand.* Positive law, then, is the only foundation of slavery. The authorities are numerous, if not numberless, to establish this position. I shall not incumber this argument by citing many of them. The few which I shall cite will contain a reference to the rest.

The grand reason against slavery given by Lord Mansfield, in Somersett's case, was, "that it is so intrinsically wrong that it is incapable of being introduced into any country, or any reasons moral or political, and can only stand on positive law." (20 State Trials. 1.)

Chief Justice Marshall says, "that it [slavery] is contrary to the law of nature, will scarcely be denied. That every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor, is generally admitted; and that no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits and appropriate them against his will, seems to be the necessary result of this admission." (Antelope, 10 Wheat., 120.)

"The first objection," says Mr. Justice Best, in the case of Forbes and Cochrane, "which occurs to me in this case, is that it does not appear, in the special case, that the right to slaves exists in East Florida. *That right is not a general but a local right*; it ought, therefore, to have been shown that it existed in Florida, and that the defendants knew of its existence. Assuming, however, that those facts did appear, still, under the circumstances of this case, this action could not be maintained.

"The question is, were these persons slaves at the time when Sir G. Cockburn refused to do the act which he was [illegible] conscientiously of opinion that they were no longer slaves. The moment they put their feet on board a *British* man-of war, not lying within the waters of East Florida, (where undoubtedly the laws of that country would prevail,) those persons who had before been slaves were free. * * *

Slavery is a local law, and therefore, if a man wishes to preserve his slaves, let him attach them to him by affection or make fast the bars of their prison, or rivet well their chains; *for the instant they get beyond the limits where slavery is recognized by the local law, they have broken their chains. they have escaped from their prison, and are free.*" (2 Barn. & Cres., 466-7, Forbes *vs.* Cochrane, S. C., 3 Dowl. and Ryland, 679.)

"I am of opinion," says Holroyd, J., in the same case, "that according to the principles of the English law, the right to slaves, even in a country where such rights are recognized by law, must be considered as founded, not upon the law of nature, but upon the particular law of that country."

"The law of slavery is a law *in invitum; and when a party gets out of the territory where it prevails*, and of the power of his master, and gets under the protection of another power, without any wrongful act done by the party giving that protection, the right of the master, *which is founded on the municipal law of the particular place only*, does not continue, and there is no right of action against a party who merely receives the slavo in that country, without doing any wrongful act."

The definition of slavery given by the Roman law implies that it is local: *Servitus est constitutio juris gentium qua quis dominio alienio,* CONTRA NATURAM, *subjicitur.* 18 Pick. Rep., 193, Commonwealth *vs* Aves. Lunsford *vs.* Coquillon, 14 Martin's Rep. 402. "The relation of owner and slave is a creation of the municipal law." 3 Marshall, 470, Ky., Rankin *vs.* Lydia. 1 Wash. C. C. Rep., 499, Butler *vs.* Hopper 4 Wash. C. C. 296, *Ex parte* Simmons. 9 Curry's Louisiana Rep., 473, Marie Louise *vs* Marot *et al.*

This point may be presented in another light. By the law of nature all men are free. But in some Governments the law of the State, upheld by the power of the State, overrides the law of nature, and enslaves a portion of the people. The law of nature recedes before this legalized violence; but it recedes no further than the legalized violence drives it back. Within the jurisdictional limits of such States, then, slavery is made *legal*, though it is not made *right*. But if a slave passes out of the jurisdiction where violence overpowers right, into a jurisdiction where right is superior to violence, he is then free; not because there is any change in the man, but because there is a change in the laws to which the man is subject.

There may, however, be some further positive law which, though it does not authorize the buying or selling of a slave, still does provide that an escaped or escaping slave may be recaptured and redelivered into bondage. Such is the third paragraph of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States. Such, too, is the act of Congress of February 12, 1793, providing for the recapture of fugitive slaves. This, however, would not be without positive law.

The debates in all the conventions for adopting the Constitution of the United States, proceed upon the ground that slavery depends upon positive law for its existence. If it did not,—if a man who has a legal right to a slave in Virginia, has a legal right to him anywhere, then the provision in the Constitution, and the act of 1793, for recapturing fugitive slaves, would have been unnecessary.

On the south side of a boundary line, then, slavery may exist by force of positive law; while, on the north side, in the absence of any such law, slavery is unlawful. A slave passing out of a jurisdiction where slavery is legalized, into a jurisdiction where it is not, becomes free. It is as though a man should migrate from one of those South Sea islands, where cannibalism is legalized, and where the public authorities, according to the reports of travellers, not only condemn and execute a criminal, *but dine on him, after he is executed*,—it is, I say, as though the subject of such a government should migrate into one where cannibalism is not lawful, and where, therefore, though he should be condemned and executed for crime, it would be no part of the sentence or the ceremony that he should be eaten. He is out of cannibal jurisdiction.

The right of freedom is a natural right. It is a positive existence. It is a moral entity. Like the right to life, it pertains, by the law of nature and of God, to every human being. This moral right continues to exist until it is abolished. Some act abolishing this freedom, then, must be proved; it must be proved affirmatively, or else the fact of freedom remains. This is the solid and indistructible ground of the maxim, that slavery can exist only by positive law; that it is a *local* institution; that the right of freedom must first be abolished before slavery can exist.

2. My second position is this: *That a man's legal condition may be changed by a change in the Government over him, while he remains in the same place, just as effectually as it can be changed by his removal to another place, and putting himself under another government.* The inhabitants of the North American colonies did not change their place of residence when they passed from under the government of Great Britain, and came under the Government of the Confederation. The Mexicans, inhabiting the then States of California and New Mexico, did not change their place of residence, when, on the thirtieth day of May last, they ceased to be citizens of the Mexican Republic, and became citizens, or *quasi* citizens of the United States. Their political relations were changed, not by their removal from under the canopy of one government and placing themselves under the canopy of another government, but by the withdrawal of one government from over them, and by the extension to them of certain *political* rights and capacities under another government. Before this thirtieth day of May, they could have committed treason against Mexico, but not after it. Before it they could not commit treason against the United States; but when they shall be citizens of the Union, they can. These vital changes in their relations are without any change in their residence. Within my recollection, an old gentleman died in Massachusetts, who had lived in five different towns, but still remained where he was born, like one of the old oak trees, on the old homestead. The part of the original town where he was born had been set off and incorporated into a new town; and that part of the second town where he lived, into a third; and so on, until he died in the fifth town, without any change of domicil. Now, this man lived under the jurisdiction and by-laws of five towns, as they were successively incorporated over him, just as much as though he had struck his tent five times, and placed himself, by successive migrations, under five different municipal jurisdictions.

A similar thing must have happened to thousands of our fellow-citizens of the Union: some of them at first lived under a foreign government; then under one territorial government; then under another; and at last have become citizens of a State, without any change of domicil. Indeed, it would seem that nothing can be clearer than the proposition, whether regarded as a legal or a political one, than that the laws and the jurisdiction may be changed over a man who continues to reside in the same place, just as effectually and as completely as a man may change the laws and jurisdiction over himself by removing to a different place. In many cases, the former works a more thorough change than the latter. The laws of Great Britain do not acknowledge the right of self-expatriation; while, at the same time, it is held, that the inhabitants of a foreign province, incorporated into the kingdom, change their allegiance without changing their residence.

3. My third proposition is this: *that the jurisdiction under which the inhabitants of what is now the District of Columbia lived, prior to the cession of the District of Maryland to the United States, was utterly and totally changed, at the moment of the cession,—at the moment when, according to the provisions of the Constitution, they ceased to be citizens of the State of Maryland, and became citizens of the District of Columbia.*

By the 17th paragraph (Hickey's Constitution) of the 5th section of the 1st article, it is provided that Congress shall have power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District, (not exceeding ten miles square,) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States."

Congress, then, has the power of sole and exclusive legislation "in all cases whatsoever," in regard to the District of Columbia. What is the meaning of the word "exclusive" in this connection? It cannot mean *absolute* and *uncontrolled*; for, if it did, it would make Congress as sovereign as the Russian autocrat. It means that no other government, no other body of men whatever, shall have concurrent power of legislation over the District; nor, indeed, any subordinate power, except what may be derived from Congress. Over every man who is a citizen of one of the United States, there are two jurisdictions,—the jurisdiction of the General Government, and the jurisdiction of the State Government. There are two governments that have the power to legislate for him; but there is only one power,—the Congress of the United States,—that can legislate for a citizen of the District of Columbia.

In Kendall *vs.* The United States, 12 Peters, 524, it is said: "There is in the District of Columbia no division of powers between the general and State governments. Congress has the entire control over the District, for every purpose of government."

So it has been held that a justice of the peace in the District of Columbia is an officer of the Government of the United States, and is therefore exempt from militia duty. Wise *vs.* Withers, 3 Crash, 331; 1 Cond. Rep. 552.

A citizen of the District of Columbia is not a citizen of any one of the United States. Hepburn *et al* ~~vs.~~ Ellzey's Lessee *vs.* Inhabitants ——, Peters' C. C. R., 45.

Up to the time of the cession, the inhabitants of this District were under two jurisdictions—that of Maryland and that of Congress; but after the cession, under that of Congress alone. Now, when the inhabitants of this District passed out of the jurisdiction of Maryland, and came under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, let us see what was the effect of such change of jurisdiction upon them.

In the act of Congress of 1790, chap. 28, sect. 1, which was an act for establishing the seat of government of the United States, there is the following clause: "*Provided, nevertheless*, That the operation of the laws of the State [of Maryland] within such District shall not be affected by this acceptance, *until the time fixed for the removal of the government thereto, and until Congress shall, otherwise by law provide.*"

Here, then, Congress *expressly* provided and contracted with the State of Maryland, that the laws of Maryland in this District should not be interfered with, until the removal of the seat of government to this place; and Congress likewise *impliedly* provided and contracted, that when the seat of government should be removed to this place, it would discharge the duty imposed upon it by the Constitution of the United States, and would assume and exercise the "exclusive legislation" provided for in that instrument. This act of Congress was approved on the 16th of July, 1790.

By the Maryland laws of 1791, chap. 45, sec 2, that State ceded to the United States that territory which now constitutes the district of Columbia, and the words of the cession are these: "in full and absolute right, as well of soil as of person, residing or to reside therein," &c. * * * provided that the jurisdiction of the laws of Maryland "shall not cease or determine *until Congress shall by law provide for the government thereof.*"

The state of the case, then, was simply this: 1. The Constitution gave Congress power of "exclusive legislation" over such district as might be ceded for the seat of government. 2. Congress by the act of 1790, above referred to, proposed to the state of Maryland to accept a portion of her territory for this purpose, but engaged not to interfere with her laws until after it had taken actual possession of the ceded territory. 3. Maryland accepted the proposition, rehearsing the condition in these words; namely, that "the laws of Maryland shall not cease or determine until Congress shall by law provide for the government thereof."

By the 6th section of the act of 1790, chap. 28, Congress provided that it would remove to this District, and make this the seat of government, on the first Monday of December, 1800. It did so; and not its express duty under the constitution, and its implied promise to the State of Maryland, were to be fulfilled, by exercising "exclusive legislation over this district."

In fulfilment of this duty and promise, Congress on the 27th of February, 1801, by the act of 1801, ch. 15, proceeded to legislate for the District of Columbia; and in the first section of that act, it provided as follows:

"*Be it enacted, &c.*, That the laws of the State of Virginia, as they now exist, shall be and continue in force in that part of the District of Columbia, which was ceded by the said state to the United States, and by them accepted for the permanent seat of Government; and that the laws of the State of Maryland, as they now exist, shall be and continue in force in that part or the said District which was ceded by that State to the United States, and by them accepted, as aforesaid."

By this act, then, Congress assumed to exercise, and did exercise, that exclusive legislation over the District of Columbia, which had been provided for by the Constitution.

That portion of the District which was ceded to Congress by Virginia, having been receded to that State by the act of Congress of July 9, 1846, (st. 1846, ch. 35), all that relates to it may, for the purposes of this argument, be laid out of the question.

On the 27th day of February, 1801, then, the laws of Maryland, *as such*, were abrogated in this district. The legislative power of Congress became exclusive. All legislative power previously possessed by Maryland over it then ceased. The connection of Maryland with this District, as a part of its former territory, and occupied by its former citizens, was dissolved. It had no longer any more legislative power over the District than Maine or Georgia had. Historically, we may talk about the laws of Maryland, as they once existed here; but practically, and as a matter of strict law and fact, her laws were no longer known within the District. The laws which governed the people of this District after the 27th day of February, 1801, were the laws of Congress, and not the laws of Maryland.

To show that this part of the District passed out from under the government of Maryland, and came under the government of the United States, I refer to Reilly, appellant, *vs.* Lamar, *et. al.*, 2d Cranch 344, 1 Cond. Rep. 322, where it is said, "By the separation of the District of Columbia from the State of Maryland, the residents in that part of Maryland which became a part of the District, ceased to be citizens of the State." It was held, in that case, that a citizen of the District of Columbia could not be discharged by the insolvent law of Maryland.

A citizen of the District of Columbia cannot maintain an action in the circuit court of the United States out of the District, he not being a citizen of the State within the meaning of the provision of the law of the United States regulating the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States. Hepburn *et. al. vs.* Ellzey, 2d Cranch, 445, 1st Cond. Rep., 444. See also Loughborough *vs.* Blake, 5 Wheat., 317, and Levy Comrt of Washington *vs.* Ringgold, 5 Peters, 451.

4. The next point of inquiry is, *what is the legal force and effect upon the subject of slavery, of the act of Congress of* 1801, *before cited*: "That the laws of the State of Maryland, as they now exist, shall be continued in force in that part of said District which was ceded by that State to the United States," &c. And here I acknowledge that the operation of this clause is precisely the same as though Congress had transcribed all the Maryland laws, word for word, and letter for letter, into its own statute book, with the clause prefixed, "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled," and the President of the United States had affixed his signature thereto. I acknowledge further, that the laws of Maryland had legalized slavery within the State of Maryland, and had defined what classes of persons might be held as slaves therein.

But it by no means follows, because Congress proposed to re-enact, in terms, for this District, all the laws of Maryland, that, therefore, it did re-enact them. It does not follow, that because two Legislatures use the same words must necessarily have the same effect. It makes all the difference in the world, whether words are used by one possessed of power, or by one devoid of power. Congress might pass a law in precisely the same words as those used by the Parliament of Great Britain, and yet the law of Congress be invalid and inoperative, while the act of Parliament would be valid and binding. We have a written constitution; Great Britain has no written constitution. The British Parliament, on many subjects, has an ampler jurisdiction than the American Congress. The law of Congress might be unconstitutional and void, while that of the British Parliament, framed in precisely the same language, might be constitutional and binding.

So the law of Maryland might be valid under the constitution of Maryland, and therefore binding upon the citizens of Maryland; while the law of Congress, though framed in precisely the same words, would be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and therefore have no validity.

Now this is precisely the case here. Congress, in attempting to re-enact the Maryland laws, to uphold slavery in this District, transcended the limits of its constitutional power. It acted unconstitutionally. It acted in plain contravention of some of the plainest and most obvious principles consecrated by the Constitution. If so, no one will dispute that its act is void. I do not deny, then, that Congress used words of sufficient amplitude to cover slavery; but what I deny is, that it had any power to give legal force to those words.

5. My next proposition, therefore, is this: that *as Congress can do nothing excepting what it is empowered to do by the Constitution, and as the Constitution does not empower it to establish slavery here, it cannot establish slavery here, nor continue it.*

Where is there any *express* power given to Congress by the Constitution to establish slavery? Where is the article, section, or clause? I demand to have the title shown. Thousands of human beings are not to be robbed of all their dearest rights; and they and their children, forever, by strained constructions, or apocryphal authority, doomed to bondage. Will those who say that Congress cannot establish a banking institution by construction, nor aid internal improvements, nor enact a tariff—will they say that can make a man a slave, and all his posterity slaves, by construction?

Nor can any power to establish slavery be deduced from the 18th clause of the 8th section of the 1st article of the Constitution, which gives Congress power "to make all which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" the powers that are granted.

What power is granted to Congress, for the exercise of which, the establishment of slavery in this District is a necessary means or preliminary? Congress has power to lay and collect taxes; to borrow money; to regulate commerce; to establish uniform rules of naturalization; to coin money; to punish counterfeiters; to establish post offices and post roads; to promote the progress of science and the arts; to establish courts; to define and punish piracies on the high seas; to declare war, to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to organize and maintain a militia; and so forth, and so forth. But to what one of all these powers, is the power to establish slavery in the District of Columbia a necessary incident? If slavery in the District of Columbia were to ceare to-day, could not the Government continue to exercise every function which it has heretofore exercised? If so, then the existence of slavery in this District is not "necessary" to the exercise of any of the expressly granted. I call upon any gentleman to name any one power of this Government which cannot be exercised, which must necessarily cease, if slavery should cease to be, in this District of Columbia? "I must pause for a reply."

Well, then, if a power to establish slavery in this District is not among the granted powers, and if it is not necessary for the exercise of any of the granted powers, then it is nowhere,—it does not exist at all. No power of Congress, then, exists, either for the creation or for the continuance of slavery in this District: and all the legislation of Congress upon this subject is beyond or against the Constitution.

Let me illustrate this in another way. Suppose there had been a religious establishment in Maryland at the time of the cession; suppose, under the auspices of Lord Baltimore, the Catholic religion had been established as the religion of the State; and that, in order to punish heresy and secure conformity to the religion of the State, an inquisition had been founded, and that the seat of that inquisition had been within the limits of the District of Columbia, at the time of the cession: could Congress, in the absence of all express or implied authority on the subject of establishing a State religion, have upheld the Catholic religion here, and appointed the officers of the inquisition to administer it? The idea is abhorrent to the whole spirit of the Constitution. But Congress had as much power to establish a national religion here, in the absence of all express or implied authority to do so, as to establish slavery here.

Congress, then, does not and cannot legalize slavery in this District. It found slavery in existence in the States; and it does not abolish it, or interfere with it, because it has no power of "exclusive legislation" in them. But Congress has as much right to go into any State and abolish slavery there, as any State, even Virginia or Maryland, has to come into this District with its laws and establish slavery here. I suppose that no jurist will contend that Congress could have passed the act of 1793, for the recapture of fugitive slaves, had it not been for the third clause in the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution, which provides for the return of the slave on the claim of his master. By this article in the Constitution, the case of *fugitive* slaves only is provided for. If a master voluntarily carries his slave into a free State, and the slave departs from his possession, he cannot reclaim him. Why not? Why cannot Congress pass a law, that if a man takes a dozen slaves to Boston, and they there see fit to strike for wages, and to leave his possession because their terms are not complied with,—why is it, I ask, that Congress cannot pass a law authorizing their seizure and delivery into the master's hands? The reason is, that the Constitution has conferred upon Congress no such express power, nor is any such power implied as being necessary to the exercise of any power that is expressed. And if Congress cannot so much as restore a slave to a master, who has voluntarily carried him into a free State, how can it continue slavery in this District, after Maryland has ceded it to this Government, whose fundamental, organic law gives it no power to create or continue slavery here?

Suppose Maryland had ceded her share of the District to Massachusetts, would not every slave in it have been instantaneously free by the Constitution of Massachusetts? They would have been transferred to a free jurisdiction,—just as much as an individual owner of a slave passes under a free jurisdiction, when he voluntarily takes his slave to the North. The legal existence of slavery was annulled in this District, when Congress exercised its exclusive power over it, just as much as the debtor's right to be discharged under the Maryland bankrupt law was annulled.

But I go further than this; and I say that the Constitution not only does not empower Congress to establish or continue slavery in this District, but again and again, by the strongest implications possible, it prohibits the exercise of such a power.

In regard to this whole matter of slavery, the Constitution touches the subject with an averted face. The abhorred word "*slave*" is nowhere mentioned in it. The Constitution is ashamed to utter such a name. The country, coming fresh from that lagoon of fire,—the American Revolution,—would not profane its lips with this unhallowed word. Hence, circumlocution is resorted to. It seeks to escape a guilty confession. Like a culprit, in whom some love of character still survives, it speaks of its offence without calling it by name. It uses the reputable and honorable word "persons," instead of the accursed word "slaves." As the Tyrian Queen, about to perpetrate a deed which would consign her character to infamy, called it by the sacred name of "marriage," and committed it,—

"*Hoc prætexit nomine culpam;*"

so the Constitution about to recognize the most guilty and cruel of all relations between man and man, sought to avert its eyes from the sight, and to justify the remonstrances of conscience against every participation in the crime, by hiding the deed under a reputable word.

But let us look at the prohibitions of the Constitution; for I maintain that there is not only no power, express or implied, in the Constitution authorizing Congress to create or continue slavery in this District, but that it is debarred and prohibited from doing so, again and again.

I suppose no one will deny that the positive prohibitions, against the exercise of certain enumerated powers, apply to Congress, when legislating for this District, just as much as when legislating for the Union at large. This doctrine has recently been strongly asserted by Mr. Calhoun in the Senate of the United States; and, as I would gladly produce conviction in southern minds, I make use of this southern authority. He affirms that Congress, in legislating for the Territories, "is subject to many and important restrictions and conditions, of which some are expressed and others implied. Among the former may be classed all the general and absolute prohibitions of the Constitutions; that is, all those which prohibit the exercise of certain powers under any circumstances. In this class is included the prohibition of granting titles of nobility; passing *ex post facto* laws and bills of attainder; the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*, except in certain cases; making laws respecting the establishment of religion, or its free exercise, and every other of like description."

Will any man say that Congress can pass an *ex post facto* law for this District, and defend itself by referring to its power of exclusive legislation over it? Can Congress pass a bill of attainder corrupting the blood of an inhabitant of this District, or repeal or suspend at any time, his right to a writ of *habeas corpus*, or establish a religion here, or interdict the free exercise thereof? No jurist, no statesman will pretend it.

But there is another prohibition in the Constitution every whit as full and explicit as any of these. The fifth article of amendment declares that "no person shall be deprived of life liberty or property, without due process of law."

Here the Constitution uses the word "person,"—the most comprehensive word it could find. "No PERSON shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Now what does this word "person" mean? Or who, under the Constitution, is such a "person" as cannot be deprived of life, liberty, or property, by virtue of an act of Congress, *without due process of law?* Let us take our definition of the word "*person*" from the Constitution itself: "No *person* shall be a Representative, who shall not have attained the age of twenty-five years," &c. (sec 2d clause of the 2d section of the 1st article) "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within the Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free *persons*, including those bound to service for a term of years and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other *persons*. (3d clause of the same section.)" "No *person* shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of thirty years," &c., (1st art. 3d section, 3d clause.) "No *person* shall be convicted (of an impeachable offence, by the Senate,) without the concurrence of two-thirds," (1st article, 3d section, 6th clause.) "No *person* holding any office under the United States, shall be a member of either House, during his continuance in office," (1st article, 6th section, 2d clause.) "The migration or importation of such *persons* as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited,"—"but a tax, or duty, may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each *person*," &c., (1st article, 9th section, 1st clause.) "No *person* holding any office of profit or trust," "shall accept any present," &c., (1st article, 9th section, 8th clause.) "No *person* holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector," (art. 2, section 1, clause 2.) "The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for two *persons*," &c. "The *person* having the greatest number of votes shall be the President, &c. "If no *person* have a majority," &c. "In every case, after the choice of the President, the *person* having the greatest number of votes of the electors, shall be Vice-President," (article 2, section 1, clause 2.*) "No *person* except a natural born citizen," &c., "shall be eligible to the office of President: neither shall any *person* be eligible to that office, who have not attained the age of thirty-five years," &c. "No *person* shall be convicted of treason, unless on the testimony of two witnesses," &c., (article 3, section 3, clause 3.) A *person* charged in any State with treason," &c. (article 4, section 2, clause 2.) "No *person* held to service or labor," &c. (article 4, section 2, clause 3.)

Now, it will be seen from all this, that the word "*person*" is used in the Constitution in the most comprehensive sense. It embraces Indians, if taxed; it embraces natives of Africa; it embraces apprentices and slaves, or those held to service or labor; and it embraces every citizen from the humblest to the highest, from the most true to the most treasonable. It embraces all, from the slave to the President of the United States. And after having used the word to embrace all these classes and descriptions of men, it proceeds to say, in an amendment, that "no PERSON *shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.*" (Amendment, article 5.)

The law of Maryland ceded this District to Congress, "in full and absolute right, as well of soil as of *person*, residing or to reside therein."

Now Congress, in attempting to legalize slavery in the District of Columbia, has provided in terms, by its adoption of the Maryland laws, that one man may hold another man in bondage in this District, "WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW," and indeed without any of law; may hold him in bondage from his birth; may beget him, and still hold him and his posterity in bondage. "Process of law" means legal proceedings. It is a phrase that does not pertain to the legislature, but to the courts. It means the institution of a suit in civil matters; the finding of an indictment, or an information in criminal ones; the issuing of subpœnas for witnesses, &c., in both. (See Art. 6 of Amendments to the Constitution.)

Now, a slave is a *person* deprived of his liberty and property, without any process of law. There has been no "due process" of law to reduce him to this miserable condition; there has been no process of law at all. A slave, therefore, in this District, is deprived of his liberty and property, in pursuance of the laws of Congress, without *any* legal process whatever, and therefore in flagrant contradiction of the fifth article of the Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Hence, the act of Congress, purporting to continue the Maryland laws respecting slav in this District, was, and is, and forever must be, until the Constitution is altered, null and void.

There is a striking historical fact in regard to the phraseology of this fifth article of amendment. Its substance was proposed by several States. Virginia proposed it in the following words: "No *freeman* ought to be taken, imprisoned, or dissnized of his freehold liberties, privileges, or franchises, or outlawed or exiled, or in any manner destroyed or deprived of his life, liberty, or property, but by the law of the land." (See 3 Elliott's Debates, 593—Proceedings of June 27, 1788. Also, 4 Elliott's Debates, 316, for the same amendment, as proposed by the State of New York.

The Virginia amendment used the word "freeman." It proposed that no "freeman" should be deprived, &c: The New York amendment used the word "*person*." And the amendment was adopted and ratified, almost in the words of the New York phraseology. The word *person* was chosen, and therefore Congress has no constitutional power to deprive of life, liberty, or property, *without due process of law*, any being embraced in the definition of that word. By its own selection of words, it is debarred not merely from depriving a "*freeman*" but deprived of a "*person*."

When Congress attempted to legalize and perpetuate slavery in this District, it violated the fourth article of the Amendments, which declares "the right of the people to be *secure* in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures." If Congress cannot authorize domiciliary searches and seizures against a single individual, can it degrade a whole race of men to the condition of slaves, and then say that *because they are slaves*, they shall not be "secure;" but shall be at the mercy of any alleged master, in regard to their persons—to be commanded or restrained, to be bought and sold? If Congress cannot authorize searches and seizures of houses, papers and effects, can it get around the Constitution, by saying we will create a class of persons who shall have no power of owning any houses, papers or effects, to be searched or seized?

Again: Congress shall pass "no bill of attainder." What is a bill of attainder? It is a bill which works corruption of blood. It disfranchises its object. It takes away from him the common privileges of a citizen. It makes a man incapable of acquiring, inheriting, or transmitting property; incapable of holding office, or acting as attorney for others; and it shuts the door of the courts against him. These disabling consequences may descend to a man's children after him, though this is not necessary. And to pass such a bill is a thing which Congress cannot do. But when Congress undertook to legalize slavery in this District, it undertook to do all this, and worse than all this. It attainted not individuals merely, but a whole race. A slave is an outlaw; that is, he cannot make a contract; he cannot prosecute and defend in court; property cannot be acquired by him, or devised to him, or transmitted through him. A white man may give his testimony against him, but he cannot give his testimony against a white man. He is dispoiled of his *liberam legem*,—his birth-right. He cannot own the food or clothes he has earned. What is his, is his master's. And this corruption of blood, which the law of slavery works, does not stop with the first, nor with the second generation,—not with the tenth nor the ten thousandth; but by the theory of the law, goes on for ever. Bills of attainder, during the history of the worst periods of the world, have applied to individuals only, or at most to a family. But here, Congress, in defiance of the Constitution, has undertaken to establish a degraded caste in society, and to perpetuate it through all generations. Now, can any reasonable man for a moment suppose that the Constitution meant to debar Congress from passing acts of attainder against individuals: but to permit it to pass wholesale, sweeping laws, working disfranchisement of an entire race, and entailing degradation for ever?

Let us look at another general prohibition of the Constitution: "No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States," (art. 1, section 9, clause 8.) "The distinction of rank and honors," says Blackstone, "is necessary in every well-governed State, in order to reward such as are eminent for their services to the public." But the framers of the Constitution did not think so; and people of the United States did not think so; and therefore they incorporated a provision into their organic law that "no title of nobility should be granted." But it matters not whether the favored individual is called "Marquess" or "Master." If he is invested by the Government with a monopoly of rights and privileges, in virtue of its title and its legal incidents, without any corresponding civil duties he belongs to an order of nobility,—he is a nobleman. Mr. McDuffie defends the institution of slavery, on the ground that it establishes the highest of all ranks and the broadest of all distinctions between men. He might as well say no nation has yet existed which has not in some form created the distinction of classes,—such as patrician and plebeian, or citizen and helot, or lord and commoner,—and that the institution of slavery stands here instead of these orders, and supersedes them all. Now, is it not inconceivable that the Constitution should interdict the bestowment of special favors to distinguished individuals for meritorious services, and yet should authorize Congress to confer the highest of all earthly prerogatives,—the prerogative over property, liberty, and volition itself, upon one class of men over another class of men? Yet if Congress can create or legalize slavery, it can establish the worst order of nobility that ever existed. It can give to one class of men the power to own and to control, to punish and despoil another class; to sell father, mother, wife and children, into bondage. To prohibit Congress from doing one of these things, and to permit it to do the other, is straining at a gnat, while swallowing a camel,—a whole caravan of camels!

But the same clause in the Constitution which gives Congress the power of exclusive legislation over this District, also empowers "to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State, in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards and other needful buildings." If, then, Congress has any constitutional power to legalize slavery in this District, it has the same power to legalize it (that is, to create it) in all places in the State of Massachusetts or New York, or any other, where it may have obtained territory from a state for a fort, magazine, arsenal, dock-yard, or other needful building. Where it has planted the flag in the middle of a city,—Philadelphia, New York, Boston, or Chicago, for a custom-house, it may create slavery there. The power to do this is conferred in precisely the same words as the power by which it has been held that slavery can be established in the District of Columbia.

And now I will occupy the few minutes that are left me in considering what seems to me the only plausible argument that can be urged in favor of the constitutionality of slavery in this District.

It may be said, that when a Territory is obtained by one nation from another, whether by conquest or by treaty, the laws which governed the inhabitants at the time of the conquest or cession, remain in force until they are abrogated by the laws of the conquering or purchasing power. For this principle, the authority of Lord Mansfield, in the case of Campbell *vs.* Hall, 1 Cowper, 204, may be cited. The decision of our own courts are to the same effect. (See 2 Gallison's Reports, 561, United States, appt., *vs.* Juan Percheman; 7 Peters, 51, Johnson *vs.* McIntosh; 8 Wheat. 543.) I do not dispute the authority of this case. But it does not touch the question I am arguing; or so far as it bears upon it at all, it confirms the views I would enforce. The principle is, that the existing laws remain in force *until* they are abrogated. I agree to this. But in the case of the District of Columbia, there was a special agreement between the State of Maryland and the States, that as soon as the United States should legislate for the District, the laws of Maryland, *as such*, should cease to be operative here. On the 27th day of February, 1801, therefore, all the rights which the citizens of this District possessed, they possessed under the law of Congress, and not under the law of Maryland. The day preceding, a citizen could have voted for Governor or other State officers of Maryland; on the day following, he could no longer vote for any such officer. On the day preceding, he could have voted for electors of President and Vice President of the United States; on the day following, he was bereft of all such right. He had active franchise, and must accept such officers and legislators as the rest of the country might choose to elect for him. On the day preceding, he might, in the character of an insolvent debtor, have been discharged under the insolvent laws of Maryland; on the day following, he could no longer be so discharged. On the day preceding, he might have been required, through a justice of the peace of the State of Maryland, to perform militia duty: but on the day following, if commissioned as a justice of the peace of the District of Columbia, he could not be compelled to perform militia duty, because he would, in such case, be an officer of the United States. On the day preceding, he might have sued in the circuit court of the United States, as being a citizen of Maryland; but, on the day following, he could not so sue, because he had ceased to be a citizen of a State. Thus the change of jurisdiction over him deprived him of some privileges, and relieved him of some burdens. It deprived him of these privileges, and relieved him from these burdens, notwithstanding the act of Congress had said, in unambiguous words, "the laws of the State of Maryland, as THEY NOW EXIST, *shall be said continue* in force in that part of the said District which was ceded by that State to the United States." But the most momentous change which was wrought by the transfer of the citizen from the jurisdiction of Maryland to the jurisdiction of the United States, was that which made it impossible for him any longer to hold a slave. Under the laws of Maryland, he might have held his slave, for her statutes had legalized slavery; but under the Constitution of the United States, he could not hold a slave; for that constitution had given Congress no power to legalize slavery in this District, and had gone so far as to make prohibitions against it. His right to hold slaves then expired, or fell, like his right to vote for United States Officers, or for State officers, or his right to be discharged under the Maryland insolvent law, or his right to sue in certain courts, &c., &c.

One point more, sir, and I have done: Why, says my opponent, did not the right to hold slaves continue after the change of jurisdiction as well as the right to hold horses? For the plainest of all reasons, I answer: for the reason that a horse is *property* by the universal consent of mankind, by the recognition of every civilized court in Christendom, without any positive law declaring it to be the subject of ownership. But a man is not property, without positive law; without a law declaring him to be the subject of ownership. There was such a positive law in Maryland; but Congress, for want of constitutional authority, could not enact, revive, or continue it. And such I verily believe would have been the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, had the question been carried before them immediately subsequent to the act of 1801. But now, as slavery has existed practically in this District for half a century, it is proper to pass a law abolishing it. It is better, under the present circumstances, that slavery should be abolished here by a law of Congress, than by the decision of a court; because Congress can provide an indemnity for the owners, and let the slaves go free. But should it be abolished by a legal adjudication, every slave would be hurried away to the South, and sold, he and his descendants, into perpetual bondage.

* This clause in the Constitution is annulled; but for all purposes of determining the true interpretation of words, it is as good as ever.

* An anecdote, which I have on the best authority, is not inappropriate. A few years ago, a citizen of the State of Connecticut absconded, leaving a wife behind him. He went to the State of Mississippi where he took a colored woman as his concubine, had children by her, acquired property, and died. The wife and heirs in Connecticut claimed the property acquired in Mississippi. The claim was contested. The honorable HENRY S. FOOTE, now a Senator from that State, conducted the defence. He denied the title of the wife in Connec

what need they have of a 'pro-slavery' paper is equally to us a problem—unless, indeed to find in its columns fuel to feed the flame of incendiarism. However, we have complied with their request, and directed the EASTERN SENTINEL to the "National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York" having no objection to read their sheet, and smile at its wilful misrepresentations of the condition of the 'poor slave."

"Were the 'committee of safety' conscious of the fact, that in favouring us with their 'respects' and autographs upon the margin of their piratical 'Standard'—their black flag of disunion—they were violating the postal law of the country at whose UNION their puny blows are directed?—We advise the postmasters to look to those philanthropic gentlemen, and see that the law is not evaded to subserve the traitor purposes of Abolitionists.

The *Kentucky*, a campaign paper, established for the purpose of defeating the present Anti Slavery movement in that State, devotes some space to us. Its editor, Mr. C. S. Semple is more simple than witty whatever he may think about it. However, we will copy his article as one among others.

NATIONAL ANTI SLAVERY STANDARD.—This is the title of a paper published at New York—the organ of the American Anti Slavery Society. It is sent to me with the request to exchange. The editor seems to be a cool fellow; he publishes some of the most violent notices of his paper by the Southern press, and talks about them without moving a muscle. I shall not treat him as the rest of my Southern brethren have, in refusing to exchange. I like the man much; his motto is—"Without Concealment—Without Compromise." This has a show of honesty.

I am anxious to learn something of the manner of getting up societies at the North. It seems that they do everything through the agency of societies. In a conspicuous place, on the first page, is the following:

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston, or S. H. Gay, assistant treasurer, at New York."

I should like to know how these donations are solicited and obtained. Do you have preachers going about through the country preaching such sermons as Samuel J. May preached at Syracuse and at Philadelphia, and inducing good, kind-hearted old women to throw into the hat to relieve the poor negroes at the South, whose "infant children may not often be put to death before their eyes, because (Oh, God!) they are valued as the property of others?" I see that the fifteenth annual meeting of the society is announced, at which it is expected to "do more, even, than any previous one has done, to drive the South to despair in defence of its felonious system of society, and the North to a more determined attitude than any portion of it has ever yet ventured to assume in defence of its own rights, and the assertion of the rights of the slave." Now I am very anxious to know whether you really intend to deprive us of the pleasure of killing little negroes before their parents' faces, or whether this grand notice of the annual meeting is to induce some of the fair daughters of Eve, or some of the dotard sons of Adam to give more money. This threat, to prevent us from killing negroes, is unfortunate and untimely; for as this is our principal amusement, our people may become offended, and refuse to send relief to the poor unfortunate free negroes of the North, who are offering to sell themselves into Slavery to get bread, because you refuse to employ them. Although your society has committed this little blunder, I hope it will be productive of some good, particularly in equalizing the classes of the North. It is very distressing to us to hear of a rich man taking his daughter away from her husband and putting her in a lunatic asylum because she married a poor man. I hope you will be good enough to give some statistics of your society, particularly the number of travailing preachers, their salaries, etc., etc.

I fear the "Kentucky" will not pay for the "Standard," and that the society will censure you for wasting their funds; but if you are on good terms with the travelling preachers, you may easily get them to make up the deficiency by inventing some new story—such as cutting off a negro's big toe to make a bung for a molasses barrel.

The *Louisville Democrat*, we are glad to see, agrees with us, at last, that it should receive the *Standard*, for its own good, and hints that we had better send it to that paper, tho' we receive nothing in return. We accept the terms, and expect no better, as take all and give nothing is the way of the South.

The *Vicksburg Whig*, also adopts a good natured tone toward us and says:

☞ We have received a number of the New York "Anti Slavery Standard," with a request to exchange. As it seems to be a good natured abolition sheet, and as it will doubtless give us much necessary information concerning the movements of the abolition party, we have no hesitancy in acceding to the request. The publishers will therefore, send us the Standard regularly, with the understanding that we intend to abuse them occasionally for their trouble.

We beg the editor to believe that *Kentucky* does not over estimate our power of endurance of abuse.

The *Era*, also,—the *Washington Era*, nothing less—honours our paper with a notice, in its two last numbers. It says:

☞ By the way, the conductors of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* have lately been sending numerous copies of their paper to Southern Journals, soliciting an exchange; and appear greatly tickled at the indignation the request has awakened, and the fierce responses made; fancying that they have created a very wholesome excitement. The explanation of this affected indignation and these tragical responses is to be found in the extract just quoted, and our remarks prefacing it. The sudden advent of the *Standard* furnished Southern Whig and Democratic Journals a precious opportunity for showing their valorous devotion to Slavery, and their fierce hostility against Northern interference—in view of the approaching elections. We advise the *Standard*, if it wish to furnish materials for electioneering to both parties equally in the South, to send regularly to equal number of their Journals. They will be sure to flare up, until the election is over.

In its last number, the snarl is repeated:

☞ The *South Carolina Telegraph* refuses to exchange with the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*. This is rather unkind, as both are bent on a Dissolution of the Union.—The motto of the former is "Non-intercourse with the North;" that of the latter, "No Union with Slaveholders." As the assaults of both are aimed at the Union, they should feel a little sympathy for each other.

Is anybody at a loss to understand this? The *Era* has been frequently noticed by the *Southern Press*, and almost uniformly for its forbearance and gentleness on the subject of Slavery. As it still has the impudence to pretend to be an Anti Slavery journal, of course it does not like this sort of testimony as to what the South esteem a paper that Slavery has anything to fear from.

## King Retro.

I.

There lived once, and perhaps lives still,
A monarch brave and mighty,
A prince of energy and will
Compact as *lignum vitæ*,
Who, among other treasures great,
Whereof he had profusion,
(As well beseemed his birth and state),
Possessed an Institution.

II.

A King's whole outfit was, years back,
A people and a saddle;
Enough if he could spur and whack,
Although his brains were addle;
But now these good old times are gone,
And kings, grown wisely heedful,
Find that, to keep their saddles on,
A bridle too is needful.

III.

Just now 'tis kingcraft's highest art
Itself to bit and bridle,
Yet king's will sometimes set their heart
Upon a whimsy idle;
One for a brimstone match stakes all,
For a frail woman's kiss one,
One won't let last year's dead leaves fall,
And so it was with this one.

IV.

Although his hobby asked no good
To give it expedition,
But bare him straight along the road
To double-distilled perdition,
Although his revenues incurred
An hourly diminution,
His Trojan horse he whipped and spurred,
And blessed his institution.

V.

Riches have been but flighty things,
From our day up to Adam,
But, if a treasure e'er had wings,
This institution had 'em;
Or rather, what was just as good
As wings, however supple,
It had ('tis true by holy rood!)
Of legs three million couple.

VI.

Whereof each being stout and tough
As those of Bishop Burnet,
Its share of body would take off
Forgetting to return it,
And, what was worse, both clothes and shoes
Went off with every biped,
For whose evasive, larcenous use,
The monarch (with a sigh) paid!

VII.

Our king, but that his eyes were dim,
Had thought it quite a blessing
To see his ruin leaving him
And cheap reform progressing,
To lose this rust which nothing did
But eat into his riches,
And of this hobby-horse get rid
Which wore out all his breeches

VIII.

But some his title to the thing
Denied, or picked a hole in it,
Nay, even hinted that the king
His grandfather had stolen it,
And when the wandering pieces got
Beyond his kingdom's borders,
The neighbour Powers said, "*Go to pot!*"
To all his threats and orders.

IX.

This made his kingship very wrath,
He growled like baited Bruin,
Swearing a great and solemn oath
That he would have his Ruin;
And, when his Council next time sate,
His fist he struck the board on
And bade them to prepare him straight
A sanitary *cordon*.

X

"Liege friends," (they all hummed *vivat rex!*)
"I wish your calm solution
Of what disease infects the legs
Of this my institution;
It must and shall be put to rout,
And all of you I'll gibbet if—
That is—I'll thank you to make out
Some penal law prohibitive.

XI.

"Although my honoured sire and those
Who lived and reigned before him,
Have been a tariff's deadly foes,
Both fixed and *ad valorem*,
Yet, rather than these insults bear,
I will impose a tariff,
Which whoso breaks shall straightway wear
A neckcloth *à la sheriff*!"

XII.

Then rose the Minister of Law
And begged he might disclose his—
"Well," growled the king, "why hem and haw?
Let's have your *diagnosis*!"
"This epidemic so malign,
I think, if I might venture I
Should say bore every mark and sign
Of chronic Nineteenth Century."

XIII.

"That's the disease beyond a doubt,"
Broke in the king, "that's firstly,
But secondly's *how keep it out?*
And that does pose me curstly;"
It bursts in like another flood
And drowns all earth in troubles,
Thrones that since Noah's time have stood
It trifles with like bubbles;

XIV.

"Nay, that huge image of men's fears,
That spiritual domination
Clamped down with sixteen hundred years
Of iron association,
It has torn up (unless, indeed,
There's taken place of late a
Recoil) and tossed it like a weed
To crumble at Gaëta."

XV.

"First," said the minister, "we ought
To fix our scale of duties;
Old forms, while Speech is free and Thought,
Are not worth my cast shoe-ties;"—
"Well, tax 'em, then," the king replied,
It taxing will prevent 'em;
Say, *ad valorem* (you decide)
Fifty or so *per centum*."

XVI.

"May't please you, as those articles
Are quoted now, a higher
Rate will be needed, for all else
Is squirting on hell-fire;
For now-a-days they're both so poor,
So in the making blupdered,
That our *percent* to make all sure,
Must be some fifty hundred.

XVII.

"Then there's a book which now-a-days
Is turned into a libel,"—
"Its name? Who wrote it?" "Please your grace,
I mean—a—a—the Bible.",
"The what? O, atheistic wound!
O, stab in part most vital!
Why, on that Book, you know, we found
Our Institution's title.

XVIII.

"Yes, but 'tis made a nuisance now
By Fourierites and fanatics,
Creatures who live, one knows not how,
On bran bread up in attics."
"Well, then, if fiends in human shape
Their vile eyes have intruded
Upon the text, there's no escape,
The Book must be excluded!

XIX.

"And yet it harrows my soul's core
To lose this Widow Cruise's
Pitcher, this never-emptied store
Of precedent for abuses;
Used prudently, it does no harm,
And, given in cautious doses,
It is a safe and sovereign charm
To lead men by their noses."

XX.

"There's yet one more new-fangled thing
That's always mischief hatching,
And, what is worse (God save the King!)
'Tis desperately catching;
They call it Light,"—"By all that's good,
Keep *that* out, Mister Minister,
Of all the new-loosed Satan's brood
Not one is half so sinister."

XXI.

Here rose an ancient Counsellor
With all men's reverence valanced,
A soul 'twixt After and Before,
In perfect quiet balanced;
When Memory, over ninety years
Can make her retrogressions,
Experience, manifold appears
But backward-looking Prescience.

XXII.

He, rising, stood there, hoar and blind,
'Mid much applausive murmur,
Seeking some staff wherewith his mind
Might safelier tread and firmer,
Then, straightening, seemed to lay one hand
Upon the Future's shoulder,
One on the Past's, and so to stand
Majestically bolder.

XXII.

What must that be, O King, think yet,
Which thou art thus protecting,
With every fence around it set
Its weakness more detecting?
All good things strike firm roots below,
The whirlwind with them wages
A truitless war, and can but blow
Their seeds along the Ages.

XXIV.

"What shall thy safeguard be against
Those forces ever living
Whose ordered march thou marr'st and pain'st
Thus vainly with them striving?
Can'st thou shut Love out? Can'st thou bar
Those endless aspirations
Which, upward from the things that are
Lead poets first, then nations?

XXV.

"Thou may'st exclude the written Word
And muzzle dead Apostles,
But can't thou gag the mocking bird,
The robins and the throstles?
These by the lonely rice swamp sing
Or 'mid the bursting cotton,
And tidings of the Father bring
To these by Man forgotten.

XXVI.

"The Letter's narrow grave no more
Confines the heart of Jesus;
From whip-scarred flesh the soul can soar
To him who made and sees us;
The air we breathe takes Freedom's part,
Prompts wanderings and departures,
Filled with the spirit and the heart
Of prophets, saints and martyrs.

XXVII.

"Your tariff may be strong and tight,
But, if you keep out Heaven, you
Must have men swifter than the light
For officers of revenue;
It floods, it bursts, and eddies in,
Or, on the wings of silence,
Floats down o'er walls of want and sin,
In spite of watchful violence.

XXVIII.

"Call back, thou may'st, the martyr age,
Heap faggots for the firing,
Yet think against your futile rage
What traitors are conspiring;
Still shines the sun, still roves the wind,
And, since the earth had motion,
The stars to human hearts have shined
Hope, courage, and devotion.

XXIX.

"Against the bestial and the false,
The Kingdom of Unreason,
All Nature gathers force and falls
At once to plotting treason;
Hush every voice you start at now,
Bring Slavery to perfection,
And every leaf upon the bough
Would whisper insurrection.

XXX

"Put trust, my Liege, while yet you can,
In the soul's inborn beauties;
Write first your debt to brother-man,
Upon your scale of duties,
Or keep all dark and close, to work
Brewing explosive vapour,
And woe betide, who in that murk
First lights Hope's farthing taper!"

XXXI.

He ceased, and straight the King broke out,
Amid much tongue-confusion,
"What! one of us with sneer and doubt
Blaspheme my Institution!
Thou crazy Fawkes, I'll find out soon
A bedlam to clap you in;
Things must be sadly out of tune
If I can't have my Ruin!"

J. R. L.

☞ The public have not forgotten the generous act of Gerrit Smith in giving deeds of lands to 3,000 of the coloured people of this State, and it is to the honour of the American character that such beneficence has been almost universally recognized as just and noble, notwithstanding its objects are of a proscribed and hated class. If there be any who have found fault with Mr. Smith for limiting his sympathies, they will no longer have even that small reproach to make against him. We learn by the following circular, which we find in the *Tribune*, that he is ready to make a similar donation of land to 1,000 white men of the poorer and landless class. We have heard a rumor that Mr. Smith is becoming interested in the doctrine of the "Second Advent." But whether his Lord comes, or he goes to meet him, he is certainly making meet preparation for the event:

CIRCULAR.

PETERBORO', May 1, 1849.

TO JOHN COCHRANE, WM. L. KENNEYS, ISAAC T. HOPPER, GEORGE H. EVANS, DANIEL C. EATON, of the County of New York.

DEAR SIRS: I still have village and city property; but on the larger share of it there remains, and must long remain, a very great debt. The debt due to the State of New York on my other land will, I hope, be paid within the coming year. All, or nearly all, such of this land as shall, then, remain upon my hands, I shall wish to give away. There will, perhaps, be enough of it to enable me to make gifts to a thousand persons. These persons must be white inhabitants of the State of New York; must be between the ages of 21 and 60; must be virtuous, landless and poor; and must be entirely clear of the vice of drinking intoxicating liquors. Moreover, they must, in each county, be taken from the sexes in equal numbers.

Along with each gift of land, there will be a gift of $10 in money. Where the land is worth removing to, and where there is a disposition to remove to it, this money will help defray the expense of removal. In, perhaps, every case, it will be sufficient to pay the two or three years' taxes now due, and also the taxes for a number of years to come.

Each county, except Madison, is to share in the proposed gifts, and each according to the amount of its population. I shall, not be blamed for making this exception by any who are aware that, in some 250 instances, I have given to inhabitants of the County of Madison either land, or money to enable them to buy land. Nor shall I be blamed for distributing the thousand parcels of land among white persons exclusively, by any who are informed that 3,000 coloured persons have received deeds of land from me entirely free of charge either for the land or for the expense of the perfected deeds thereof. I will remark here that the deeds of the 1,000 parcels will be made, acknowledged and prepared for record at my own expense.

The number of beneficiaries in each county will be as follows:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Albany | 30 | Herkimer | 14 | Rockland | 4 |
| Allegany | 16 | Jefferson | 26 | Saratoga | 16 |
| Broome | 10 | Kings | 32 | Schenectady | 6 |
| Cattaraugus | 12 | Lewis | 8 | Schoharie | 12 |
| Cayuga | 20 | Livingston | 12 | Seneca | 10 |
| Chautauque | 18 | Monroe | 28 | St. Lawrence | 26 |
| Chemung | 8 | Montgomery | 12 | Steuben | 20 |
| Chenango | 16 | New York | 150 | Suffolk | 12 |
| Clinton | 12 | Niagara | 14 | Sullivan | 6 |
| Columbia | 16 | Oneida | 34 | Tioga | 8 |
| Cortland | 10 | Onondaga | 28 | Tompkins | 14 |
| Delaware | 14 | Ontario | 16 | Ulster | 18 |
| Dutchess | 22 | Orange | 20 | Warren | 6 |
| Erie | 32 | Orleans | 10 | Washington | 16 |
| Essex | 10 | Oswego | 22 | Wayne | 16 |
| Franklin | 8 | Otsego | 20 | Westchester | 18 |
| Fulton | 6 | Putnam | 4 | Wyoming | 10 |
| Genesee | 10 | Queens | 12 | Yates | 8 |
| Greene | 12 | Rensselaer | 24 | | |
| Hamilton | 2 | Richmond | 4 | Total | 1,000 |

The next thing in this letter is to say, that I have a great favour to ask of you. It is, that you go to the pains of selecting the beneficiaries in your county; and that you do, by 1st of March next, let me know their names and residence.

To guard the beneficiaries of your county against disappointment, I wish you would inform them, that most of the land is of an inferior quality; that it is probable, that, in some instances, it will prove to be unfit for farming; in some of little or no value either for farming or timber; and that it is possible (I trust, but barely possible,) that, in some instances, my title will fail. You will, moreover, inform them, that in the event of my not having land enough to give each of the thousand a parcel, some of those chosen in your county may be unsupplied. You are, however, authorized to say to them, that whoever of the thousand shall fail to get a parcel of land from me, shall get, instead thereof, $40 in money—and this, too, in addition to the $10. The $50 will enable its possessor to buy forty acres of Government land. I hope that it will be expended in some land or other: for one of my deepest convictions is, that every person, who can, should make himself the acknowledged owner of a piece of land. His doing so would hasten the day when the right to the soil shall be everywhere acknowledged to be as absolute, universal and equal, as the right to the light and the air. May that blessed day come quickly!—for, until it does come, our world will be one of disorder, oppression, poverty, vice;—and, let me add, that it never will come, until the religion and politics, the Churches and Governments of the world shall be so imbued with the spirit of justice and brotherly love, as to call for the coming of that day.

The parcel for each beneficiary will, probably, vary from 30 to 60 acres. In a few instances, it may exceed 60; and, in a few, where its value may be far above the average of the parcels, it may be less than half of 30.

All the land is in the State of New York.

Respectfully, your friend, GERRIT SMITH.

## Slaves to California.

Rumors, from time to time, have reached us of parties starting from the South for California accompanied by their slaves. Such movements have unquestionably been made, but, we have supposed, rather for the convenience of individual slaveholders than with a deliberate determination to establish Slavery in that country. It has been proposed, it is true, that armed occupation be taken of the territory by slaveholders, and that Slavery be established and defended at the point of the bayonet and the bowie-knife, but such a proposition coming from such fanatics as John C. Calhoun, we did not suppose would meet with much favour with the mass of the Southern people. We were apparently mistaken in setting any limit to the infernal zeal of the slaveholders.

The *Evening Post* has received a letter from a correspondent in Virginia, an extract of which it publishes. The writer says:

"The movements making at this time at the South is what I am most particularly anxious to call your attention to. I do not wish to excite sectional animosities and criminations, but I wish to see a scheme, now in progress arrested. It is no other than a plan to introduce Slavery into California and New Mexico. Ever since the hope of preventing the passage of the Wilmot Proviso was abandoned, southern ultraists have been preparing a very successful scheme to propagate Slavery into these territories. If they do not succeed, it will not be for the want of zeal and devotion. According to Mr. Holmes, of South Carolina, this scheme is well laid and comprehensive enough to insure success.

"The *Memphis Eagle* tells us that a large majority of the companies formed and forming for *El Dorado*, carry with them slaves. A Mr. Howard, of Columbus, Georgia, proposes to form one of five hundred, to carry out from one to two thousand slaves. Personally I know that several of the companies which left this State carried out slaves with them. A member of Congress, from Tennessee, said to me that within his own knowledge there would be taken to California, from ten to twelve thousand slaves this summer. From reliable evidences, I know that whole families are moving with all their slaves, from the States of Tennessee, Arkansas and Missouri. It is said that even slave drivers are making up gangs to carry out. It is well known, from a fair test in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, that the slaves make the best gold miners.

"The valley of the Sacramento in the summer is as unhealthy to the white man as the low cotton and rice lands of North and South Carolina and Georgia, and the belief is that the miners will be compelled to resort to slave labour. Those who carry out slaves undertake to say that the thirst for gold will soon quiet all scruples of conscience about the sin of Slavery. Besides, the Governor of California is a slaveholder, and the principal conductors of the press and officers are either slaveholders or from the slave States. All this looks as though the introduction of Slavery into that territory might succeed, if timely action is not taken to prevent it. I am no alarmist, and despise sectional animosities, but I cannot feel willing to see an institution so much to be deprecated planted there."

The Mr. Howard, of Columbus, Ga., referred to, has issued proposals for the formation of a company of young men of that State, to proceed to California, in which he says, "I propose to all who are disposed to visit or emigrate to California, an organization which, in the absence of law, alone can secure to them the full enjoyment of their constitutional rights." The "constitutional rights"—or rather right, for there is but one at the South—the enjoyment of which is to be secured, is thus explained in article 3d of Mr. Howard's Prospectus:

3d. That each member shall take with him at least one, and not more than four slaves.

The company is to be formed into a semi-military corps, with the purpose set forth in the 8th article:

8th. The object being to enjoy the rights, in common with other citizens, in a territory which belongs to the people of the United States, without distinction of sections, it is proper they should be well armed, and while abstaining from all innovations upon the rights of any one, be prepared to repel any and all aggressions.

Here, as before, the right referred to is the great wrong of the South, which, if it be not legally established in the new Territories by Congress, but still existing there through the exertion of individuals, or Southern slaveholding associations, will surely lead to future trouble. The South, however, shows its usual wisdom in forestalling public action, whereby she gains two advantages. She will be more likely to carry the measure in Congress when Slavery already exists in California; and if she does not, the difficulty will be to eradicate an evil already planted.

The *Post* urges the subject upon the attention of the Free Soil party, and for this reason, among others, that should slaves be carried to California, and Slavery, at some future time, not legalized there, that "the territory will be deluged with an ignorant and thieving population, whose presence will be an unmitigated curse to it and its inhabitants, and a strife between the slave proprietors and the free laborers will grow up, fruitful of discord and crime." We don't understand the *Post*. The slaves are ignorant but not thieving; the slaveholders, thieving and ignorant enough, it is true, but not usully so described; which class is referred to?

## How it Looks to Ex-Slaveholders.

The (Kingston, Jamaica,) *Morning Journal*, in noticing the Southern Convention held at Washington last winter, makes some remarks, which, as an evidence of how such a movement looks to those who have had the experience of an Anti-Slavery agitation, are worth reading. We copy them for the edification chiefly of our Southern exchanges, assuring them that abolition instinct is in accordance with the experience of those who know what it is to have been on the defensive for Slavery, and that the flattering among the slaveholders is a comforting promise of success, and not, as they mean it to be, an assurance of the hopelessness of agitation:

The question of Slavery is of such deep interest to us and the island at large, and the circumstances alluded to in the *American* of such importance, that we felt disposed to doubt the correctness of it. We confess that, notwithstanding all we have heard and read respecting the progress Anti-Slavery views and feelings have made in the United States, we were unprepared for such a move as the Southern members of Congress appear to have made on the 22d of Dec. This meeting proves, beyond doubt, that Slavery, as it has existed in the Union, is in danger—that slave-owners feel the ground sliding from under their feet, and that it has become necessary for them to seriously and calmly inquire, how is Slavery to be upheld, and the interests of slaveholders preserved? A few years have produced serious changes in the state of affairs in America in relation to Slavery, and the future is big with importance to the men who hold property in men. There was a time when these laughed to scorn the efforts of philanthropists, and fancied their system impregnable to their attacks. Now they meet in the Capital to consider Southern rights and Southern interests as connected with the question of Slavery—which had best be done to arrest the current which threatens to sweep Slavery away. But, if it is surprising to hear of a meeting of members of Congress for this purpose, how much so is it to read the langnage of those members? When slave-owners, or the representatives of slave-owners, urge caution and prudence, and talk of "patriotism and not passion," may we not conclude they feel that their craft is in danger? and that it is necessary for them to be very careful how they act? Then, if the report before us be correct, there is evidently a good deal of timidity felt and manifested. Mr. Bayley, of Virginia, would "propose the appointment of a committee to draft an address to the people of the slaveholding States, merely showing the progress of Abolitionism, and not suggesting any mode of remedy, leaving that to be devised by the people of the States and the State Legislatures." The Representatives of the South dread the "blind and prejudiced majority in Congress," who, according to General Rusk, are about to trample upon the Constitution—that is, to seal the doom of American Slavery, and assemble themselves together to devise means of averting the dreaded evil. To the advocates for universal emancipation this meeting will be productive of unmixed delight. It shows more clearly and decidedly than anything else that we know of the alarm of the Southern members, and as these were not likely to be alarmed without cause, the cheering prospects of Abolition in America. We have it upon their own confession that unanimity of feeling and action—that cautious, prudent, and firm proceedings on the part of all interested, was necessary to defeat the attempts of the North. But why talk of unanimity? Were slaveholders ever otherwise than unanimous in any measure that affected their interest in the blood, bones, and sinews of their fellow-men? Did they ever differ in opinion as to the propriety of rivetting even more tightly the fetters of their slaves? Unanimity for sooth! They have been unanimous all through, and require something more now to assist them in this their hour of difficulty. What that something is to be, is left to the "Sovereign States" and the people to determine. As we have had so much of *annexation* of late, it would only be an agreeable pastime if the American slaveholders would try their hands at *separation*. There is a time for all things according to the wise man, and therefore a time for this latter. What that time beginning?

## The Anniversary.

The Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY was held at the TABERNACLE on Tuesday, the 8th inst, in accordance with previous announcement. Contrary to our usual good luck on this occasion, the weather was extremely disagreeable. A north-east wind, as chilly as a wet sheet, or as if it blew up Boston harbour, and a hard rain, mad, out-of-doors a most disagreeable place to be *in*, and as a consequence a cold meeting, and a beggarly account of empty benches was predicted. We were surprised, however, and no less cheered to face the largest audience that we have ever yet seen at any Anti-Slavery gathering in the Tabernacle. The number of delegates of our own people is certainly not larger than has been present for several years past, and the fact of so crowded an audience is to be accounted for on some other ground than that of mere curiosity which is certain to ensure anything a hearing in New York during Anniversary week. And if we may not attribute it altogether to growing conviction among the people the necessity of a Dissolution of the Union, we are, least, certain that nothing but a strong desire to hear, and at a determination to do something upon the great question of American Slavery, could have brought together such a meeting upon such a day, to listen to those whose names have long been obnoxious as the most fanatical of the original Abolitionists. The influence of such a beginning cannot fail to be felt throughout the subsequent meetings of the Society at the Minerva Roome.

The speakers at the Tabernacle were Messrs. Pillsbury, Phillips, and Douglass, and it is acknowledged, on all hands, that they rarely, if ever, did themselves, or the cause, more honour. The *Standard* of next week will contain a full report of their speeches.

The Society adjourned from the Tabernacle at 1½ o'clock to the Minerva Rooms, at 3 o'clock, and a full report of its subsequent motion will also be given in the next *Standard*.

AMERICAN SCENES AND CHRISTIAN SLAVERY.—Such is be title of a new book just published in London, of which the *Glasgow Friend* speaks thus:

The account which the author of the above volume gives us of his tour, is at once interesting in itself in many particulars, and his style is light and lively. Like every other unsophisticated Christian, who visits the boasted land of liberty, our tourist appears to have seen Slavery in all its hideous deformity; and he is unsparing of his censure both of the civil and ecclesiastical institutions of that country, on this account.

That the Churches of America are the bulwarks of Slavery, and that the Northern States are guilty of conniving at the iniquity, are positions abundantly fortified by this writer; and we have much pleasure in recommending his tome to the notice of our readers, on the ground—were others wanting—that of his sound Anti-Slavery sentiments.

The author of the work is the Rev. Ebenezer Davies, late minister of Mission Chapel, New Amsterdam, Berbice. Many of our readers will remember having met him at the Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society two years since in this city. We are glad to be assured by the *Friend's* notice of this work, that the representations made to him by pro-slavery clergymen as to the position of the American Church, and the attention paid to him by them, neither obscured his vision, nor shut his mouth, as has too often been the case with his brother-clergymen visiting this country from Great Britain. The character of his book, however, is evidently such as to preclude its republication here by any of our booksellers who cater to the literary taste of this country.

BEWARE OF AMERICAN LAND JOBBERS.

*To the Editor of the Examiner and Times.*

SIR,—I desire, through your widely circulated paper, to warn the public against being, under pretence of affording facilities to emigrants, deceived by a set of adventurers, who having obtained possession of great tracts of land in Texas, are now using the English press to make the tide of emigration flow to their acres. Texas has not one single qualification which Illinois and Iowa does not possess; and it has the CURSE OF SLAVERY entailed upon it. It was iniquitously "annexed," expressly in order that it might become a market for the slave-breeding States of Virginia an Kentucky. Let the working man be especially on his guard. *Labour is not honoured in any of the slave States.*—The man who works with the slave shares in the slave's degradation. My advice to all emigrants is not to buy an inch of land till they see it. There is abundance of good land and cheap in the free States, and *it is only in the free states where property advances in value.*

ARCHIBALD PRENTICE.

The above timely warning we find in the Glasgow (Scotland) *Examiner and Times*. Many of our readers will recollect the passages from the letters of Mr. Prentice, while travelling in this country, which we copied some months ago, from that paper; since then they have been collected in a volume, but have found no publisher in this country—why the above letter will explain: Mr. Prentice speaks too plainly of the 'Peculiar Institution.'

## Domestic Correspondence.

### Letter from Philadelphia.

The past month has been one of much interest in our circle. First came a meeting, in which most reformers here are interested; the Annual Meeting of the Rosine Association. As the name—derived from Rosa Govani, an Italian lady, who founded establishments for the shelter and employment of the destitute of her own sex—may not be understood, it may be well to explain that this association is devoted to the care and reformation of those, who, in every sense, may be termed "abandoned women."

There were many points of interest connected with the establishment of this Association. The first, that a *public* meeting of women was called, that the call was responded to by several hundreds, and that the meeting was conducted without the aid of "gentlemen officers." Of those who responded to the call there were many who have long been labourers in the Anti-Slavery cause, also a number who have shunned the friends of the slave, and shrunk from intercourse with his advocates. Knowing this, though a few of the noble women who were the foremost in this work urged the co-operation of our friends, and feeling too that their time and energies belonged first to the slave, they cared not, while sympathizing with this, as with every effort for humanity, to take a prominent place in the movement. In the course of the arrangements for carrying out their plans, a committee was appointed to solicit donations for the object. When our friend Lucretia Mott, was named, she, ever true to the principle of the equal rights of all, and ever quick in discerning, the time and place to apply this principle, before allowing her name to be taken, asked if it was contemplated to receive into the establishment those who o wished its shelter, *without distinction of colour*. The "vexed question" sadly disturbed the equanimity of many—they did want to do something kind, they did feel their hearts to glow with commiseration for the objects they proposed to relieve, but ——. In short the question was not aaswered; our friend declined serving, and the matter ended in the meeting. But that simple question went forth to agitate domestic circles, to do a good work in the hearts of many, so that when the Constitution of the Society was framed, there was no restriction as to colour; and it is believed that the day is not distant when the Institution will be conducted in accordance with the principles of equality. By the way, it may be mentioned, that in the forming of a society some three years since, to open a "House of Industry" for the employment of the poor, the same question arose; the majority met it faithfully; and through their adherence to principle occasioned a few influential women to leave them—and a delay in the formation of society—yet, in a short time, they were able to go on with their plans, which have abundantly prospered, and the more for their faithfulness, having within the last year received upwards of one thousand dollars from one individual, "because they aided the coloured people as well as the white."

Since this meeting of the Rosine, some eighteen months since, several others have been held with marked improvement, and now, at their first annual meeting, a report from the Managers was read, showing on their part great energy and efficiency in the work committed to them. This meeting, our friend A. K. Foster—who you are aware was with us for a short period—attended. After many others had expressed the great satisfaction which all must have felt on the reading of the report, she expressed the pleasure she felt in listening to the detail of effort made, and of good accomplished. There should be rejoicing when *one* was saved; but there was a *cause* for this wide spread misery we deplored, the depths of which had not been reached, a fount whence these bitter waters flowed—an ocean of iniquity deluging the land, rendering almost unavailing these spasmodic efforts for good. She narrated the case of one victim of this system, a sysrem protected by law. The attention of all present was absorbed—the hearts of all touched. She stated that a large proportion of those who filled the houses of ill-fame in Philadelphia, New York and Boston, were from the South; the daughters of the poor whites, ashamed to beg, or to work by the side of the slave, became easy victims of the licentious. While our friend depicted in her own forcible manner, the wide spread desolation of this licensed scourge, the audience, with the slight exception of some two or three conservative "exclusives," listened with an earnestness that proved their deep interest in these developements, adding another evil to the thousand with which Slavery curses our country. A. K. F. in conclusion, congratulated the audience on the great advance in public sentiment. Ten years since, had she spoken thus, the benches would have been cleared; twenty years since she herself would have turned away incredulous from such statements.

M. Townsend, to whose energy and devotion with the assistance of those she has called to her aid, the Rosine owes its existence; confirmed the statements made by A. K. F. In the visits which she had repeatedly made to these houses of death, she had ascertained that a large proportion of the inmates were from the South, and that a few days previous to the meeting, while sitting with some of the inmates of the Rosine, she had asked them of their birthplaces. Five out of six were from the South! What has the North to do with Slavery?

A. K. F., remained some weeks in our city and neighbourhood, labouring dilligently, earnestly, effectively, as she ever does for her brethren in bonds. Ere she leftus, in answer to a call from the Philadelphia F. A. S. Society, Lucy Stone arrived from Massachusetts. During the past three months many meetings have been held in this city and neighbourhood, a number of them in the Lecture Room of the Museum, a room which has never before been opened to us, and which two years since would not admit Anti-Slavery. This special effort made to arouse the women of this region to come up to our aid, we trust has not been in vain. All of us rejoice in knowing L. S., and in feeling that in her the slave has a true and able advocate.

On Friday evening a meeting was held on another, though a kindred subject—the "Woman Question." The wrongs of her sex, next to the wrongs of the slave presses most heavily on L. M.'s spirit—as upon what *true* woman's do they not?—and against these her protest has for many years been again and again made. She has long wished to call a meeting on this subject, and knowing the great interest that L. S., feels in it, the opportunity of her being with us, was taken to call the public together. A large number attended and listened with profound attention to L. M., while she showed from Scripture the right and the duty of woman to share the labours of the pulpit with her brother. L. S, followed, graphically depicting the condition of woman, in her social, civil, and religious relations, and the sufferings incident to individuals and to society in consequence of her degradation. Her vivid descriptions and illustrations deeply interested her audience, whose applause testified that they sympathised with the speaker.

But interesting as is this question, and doubtless destined soon to be one of "*the* questions of this nineteenth century," it must not be "lugged" into your paper though only as the tale of a letter, lest it might be suspected of a wish to mount the platform of the Society.

Your paper—may it go on conquering and to conquer: a most fit and worthy Standard of our advancing hosts.

Yours, truly, H. H.

## Married.

On the 30th April, at Philadelphia, after the order of the Society of Friends, JOSEPH D. THURSTON, of Flushing, N. Y. to MARY, daughter of William Wharton, of the former place.

On Thursday, April 26, by Rev. Wm. H. Hornblower, A. B. WOODRUFF, Esq. to Miss ISABELLA DEWOLF, daughter of the late Gen. George DeWolf, of Bristol, Rhode Island.

On Monday Morning, April 30, at Saint Peter's Church, Philadelphia, by the Rev. Wm. H. Odenherner, HENRY A. CRAIN, of this city, to KATHRINE SERGEANT, daughter of the Hon. John Sergeant.

At Friends' Meeting in New Bedford, May 3d, ROBERT LINDLEY MURRAY, of New York, to RUTH S. daughter of Wm. C. Taber, of the former place.

In Cambridge, April 00, HENRY SARGENT, MD. of Worcester, to Miss CATHARINE DEAN, daughter of the late Asa Whitney, Esq. of Boston.

## Died.

On Tuesday, May 1st. ALVAN STEWART, Esq. formerly of Utica, in the 59th year of his age.

At the Maryland Patapsco Institute, April 14, Hon. JOHN PHELPS, an eminent lawyer and statesman.

In Rockville, Connecticut, April 25, Mrs. LYDIA HALE, widow of Rev. David Hale, of South Conventry, Connecticut, and the mother of the late David Hale, of the New York *Journal of Commerce*, aged 85.

In Roxbury, May 1, JUDITH BUSSEY, widow of the late Benjamin Bussey, aged 86.

April 27, MIRIAM PHILLIPS, youngest child of Rev. George W. and Miriam Blagden, 4 years 5 months.

In Lexington, Virginia, on Monday the 17th instant, Mrs. SUSAN PRESTON TAYLOR, relict of the late Hon. Wm. Taylor, and sister of Governor McDowell and Mrs. Senator Benton.

At Washington City, 24th instant, the Rev. GAMALIEL BAILEY, aged 84 years.

At Flushing, on Saturday evening, May 5, JAMES MACDONALD, M.D. aged 45 years.

At Philadelphia, April 24th, Miss MARY HAMILTON, daughter of the late Andrew Hamilton, Esq. in her 78th year. With this venerable lady becomes extinct the name of one of the most distinguished families of Pennsylvania—that of Andrew Hamilton, the most eminent of our Colonial Lawyers—of James Hamilton, the most worthy and only native Provincial Governor—and of Wm. Hamilton, of the Woodlands, the earliest American patron of the Fine Arts, and of Horticulture in its most elegant

## Miscellany.

## CONFIDENCES.

BY ALPHONSE DE LARMARTINE.

*[Translated for the Standard.]*

### BOOK II.

#### CHAPTER VI.

What nights were these, and how short seemed their hours to my father, thus re-united to all that he most loved. At the distance of a few steps were sentinels, prison grates, dungeons and death! They did not, like Romeo and Juliet, measure the progress of the stars through the night by the songs of the nightingale and the lark; they knew it by the tread of the sentry making his round beneath the windows, and the frequent sound of the changing guard.

Before the approach of dawn my father would recross the street and silently re-enter his grated window. The cord was then untied, my mother carefully withdrew it, and hid it for future use under a mattrass in a corner of the attic.

The husband and wife had similar interviews, from time to time, but it was necessary to use great caution, and to prepare for them carefully, for, to say nothing of the danger of falling into the street, or of being discovered by the guard, my mother could not depend upon the fidelity of one of her women, who might by a single word compromise my father's life.

At this time the Pro-consuls of the convention had divided the provinces of France among themselves, and exercised in the name of the public safety, an absolute, and frequently a sanguinary power. Upon a word—an emotion—a signature of one of these representatives, frequently depended the fortune, life and death of whole families. My mother who saw the axe suspended over the head of her beloved husband, had been often moved to throw herself at the feet of the representatives of the convention, and entreat of them liberty for my father. Her youth, her beauty, her loneliness, the infant in her arms,—the counsels even of my father himself, had until now withheld her.

But the entreaties of the rest of the family, confined in the prisons of Autun obliged her to take steps alike painful to her pride and her opinions.

She obtained of the Revolutionary authorities of Magon a passport for Lyons and Dijon. How many times she has described to me, her unwillingness, her discouragements, and her terrors, when it became necessary, after innumerable trials, and many solicitations rudely repelled, at last to appear trembling in the presence of some representative of the people!

Sometimes it would be a vulgar and brutal wretch, who refused to listen to a weeping woman, and dismissed her with threats and accusations of wishing to interfere with the course of national justice. Sometimes she would meet a man of feeling, whom her aspect of deep tenderness and touching despair, would incline in spite of himself to pity, but who apparently hardened by the presence of his colleagues would refuse with his lips what his heart accorded.

None of all these pro-consuls left so favorable an impression of his character upon my mother's mind as the representative Javogues.

She saw him at Dijon and was received by him kindly and respectfully. She had carried me in her arms to his salón, in the hope that the sight of a young mother, and an innocent child might excite his compassion with two-fold power.

Javogues begged her to be seated, and complained of the severity of the mission, which his office, and the safety of the republic imposed upon him. He placed me upon his knee, and when my mother expressed by a start her fear that he would let me fall:

"Fear nothing, citoyenne," said he, "republicans too have sons," and as I laughingly played with the ends of his tri-coloured scarf, he added, "your child is very beautiful for the son of an aristocrat. Bring him up as a patriot and a good citizen." He spoke to her of my father with interest, and held out some hope that he would soon be at liberty. Perhaps we owe it to Javogues that he remained forgotten in his prison, for a summons of trial, was at that epoch a decree of condemnation.

My mother returned to Magon, and shut herself up in her narrow dwelling opposite the Ursulines. From time to time, when the night was unusually dark, the moon absent, and the echoes swept away by the winter wind, the knotted cord would slide from one window to the other, and my father would venture to spend a few troubled but happy hours with his wife and child.

Thus passed eighteen long months. The ninth of July opened the prisons; my father was free. My mother went to Autun to bring back his old and infirm parents to their long deserted home.

A short time after their return, my grandfather and grandmother died peacefully in their beds. They had survived the great tempest, shaken but not uprooted by it. They had lost none of their children, and could close their eyes with the hope that the fury of the heavens was exhausted, and that gentler skies were in prospect for those whom they left behind.

### BOOK III.

#### CHAPTER I.

The fortune of my grandfather, according to his wish, and the custom of the times should have passed entire to his eldest son; but the new laws having annulled the substitutions, and suppressed the right of birth, and the vows of poverty made by my father's sisters becoming void in law, the family were compelled to a division of the property.

The estates were considerabe both in Franche Comté and Burgundy. My father might have claimed his share with his brothers and sisters; by a word he might have changed his prospects, and obtained one of those beautiful and territorial possessions then belonging to his family.

His scrupulous deference to the wishes of his father prevented a thought of their violation, even after that father's death. The revolutionary laws which abolished the rights of primogeniture, were all recent, and however just they might appear, they still had a compulsory character, and seemed to him to do violence to the paternal authority. To have appealed to them against his elder brother would have appeared to him an abuse of his position.

He quietly renounced his right of inheritance, and contented himself with the small provision which was assured to him by his marriage contract, and thus became poor, when a word would have made him rich.

The family estates were divided. Each of his brothers and sisters received an ample portion. He alone claimed nothing, and his only possession was the little domain of Milly which came to him upon his marriage, and of which the income was, then, only, two or three thousand livres.

My mother's marriage portion was small. The revenues of the posts occupied by her father and brothers in the house of Orleans had disappeared at the revolution. The princesses of the Orleans Family were exiles. They sometimes wrote to my mother. They did not forget their childish friendship with the daughters of their under governess. They remembered her alike in exile and in prosperity.

#### CHAPTER II.

My father did not believe himself released by the revolution from his duty to his colours, and this conviction closed the career of fortune to him.

An income of three thousand livres and a small country house, ruinous and empty, hardly formed even an humble competence for himself, his wife and the numerous children, who now gathered around his table; but a peaceful conscience, his love for his wife, and the rural simplicity of his tastes, his strict but generous economy, the perfect conformity of his wishes to his situation, his pious trust in God, remained; and with these he faced courageously the difficulties which beset him.

My mother, young and beautiful, brought up amid all the elegancies of a magnificent court, exchanged, with her accustomed smiling resignation and inward happiness, the apartments and the gardens of a princely establishment, for the little unfurnished chamber of a house which had been uninhabited for a century, and for the small garden of a quarter of an acre enclosed by loose stones, where the lofty dreams of her youth were to terminate.

I have heard them both say, that, notwithstanding the difficulties which surrounded them, these first years of tranquility, succeeding the shock of revolutions, and which permitted to their solitude the repose of loving hearts, and the enjoyments of cultivated minds were, all things considered, the happiest years of their lives. My mother, even when suffering much from poverty placed no value upon riches. How many times has she said to me, in after years, pointing to the narrow boundaries of the garden and the fields of Milly: "It is very small, "but it is large enough if we know how to proportion our wishes and our habits to it. Happiness is "within ourselves, and we cannot increase it by "extending the limits of our meadows and our vine-"yards. Happiness cannot, like lands, be measured "by acres, it consists only with resignation of heart. "God grants it willingly to the poor as well as to "the rich, that none should dream of seeking it save "in HIM who alone can bestow it."

#### CHAPTER III.

I will not imitate the *Confessions* of J. J. Rousseau.

I cannot dwell upon the trifling events of my infancy.

Life commences only with the period of feeling and thought. Until then, man merely exists,—he is not even a child. The tree springs doubtless from the roots, but these roots, like our instincts, should never be exposed to the light. Nature has designedly concealed them; there lies her secret. For us the tree commences its existence at the moment when it shoots from the earth, and shows by its stem, its bark, its boughs, and its leaves, what wood, shade, or fruit we may one day expect from it. It is the same with man—let us leave his cradle to the nurse and his first smiles, and tears, and childish words to the mother's transports. I wish to offer you only my first reasonable recollections.

The earliest scenes which I can recall in those inquisitions which man makes, in order to discover something of himself in the dim past, are the following.

#### CHAPTER IV.

It is night. The doors of the small house of Milly are shut. The house dog barks from time to time in the court. The autumn rain dashes against the panes of the two lower windows, and the wind, blowing in gusts, sends forth as it stirs the branches of the plane trees, and penetrates through the openings of the shutters, that intermittent and melancholy wailing for which we listen in a great forest of pines.

The room in which I find myself is very large, and nearly unfurnished. At the farthest part is a deep alcove which contains a bed. The bed curtains are of white serge checked with blue. It is that of my mother's. Two cradles, one large and the other small, rest on wooden benches at the foot of the bed. These contain the beds of my youngest sisters who have already been long asleep. A good fire of vine stalks is burning in a large chimney of white stone, whose entablature the revolutionary hammer has broken in many places, while endeavouring to efface the achievements and the Fleur de lys of its ornaments. The iron back of the chimney has been turned, doubtless because the royal arms decorate the reverse. Great beams, blackened by smoke, like the planks which they support, form the ceiling. Beneath, is neither inlaid floor, nor carpet,—only square unpolished bricks, of the original colour of the clay, every where defaced and broken by the nailed shoes and wooden *sabots* of the peasants, who made this apartment their ball-room during my father's imprisonment. Neither paint nor paper decorates the walls of the chamber, and the plaster, crumbled in many places, discloses the rough stones of the outer wall seen like naked limbs through a tattered garment.

In one corner, a little harpsichord stands open, and some sheets of the music of the *Devin de village* of J. J. Rousseau are scattered upon the instrument; nearer the fire, in the middle of the room is placed a small card table, whose green cover is spotted with ink and full of holes. Upon this table two tallow candles are burning in candlesticks of copper plated with silver, and throw some light, and many shadows swayed by the wind, upon the white walls of the apartment.

Opposite the chimney, his elbow resting on the table, sits a man with a book in his hand.

His tall and robust form displays still all the vigour of youth. The brow is clear and open—the eye blue—a cheerful and gracious smile discloses brilliant teeth. Some remnants of his former costume, above all the arrangement of his hair, and a certain military precision of attitude, betray the retired officer.

If we doubt this, we have only to observe his sabre, his pistols, his casque, and the gilded plates of his horse's bridle, which suspended from a nail on the wall, gleam through the darkness of a small cabinet which opens into the chamber.

This man is our father. On a couch of woven straw, in the corner formed by the chimney and the wall of the alcove, is seated a woman who appears still very young though she is nearly thirty-five. Her tall figure has all the flexibility and elegance of youth. Her features are so delicate, her dark eyes have an expression so clear and so penetrating; the blue veins are so distinctly seen through her transparent complexion, whose changing colour betrays her slightest emotion, her fine black hair falls in rich waves, and sweeps so luxuriantly over her face and down her shoulders that it is impossible to say whether she is eighteen or thirty.

No one could wish however to lessen her age, by one even of the years which have so matured her expression, and finished her beauty.

That beauty, however, charming in each feature when separately considered, is chiefly visible in the harmony and grace of their union, and most of all, in that beaming tenderness of expression, the true beauty of the soul, which illuminates the features from within: that light of which the most charming countenance is but the outward manifestation.

She is reclining upon the cushions of the couch and holds in her arms a sleeping child, whose head rests upon her mother's shoulder, and who has still twisted round her fingers one of those long black tresses, with which she was playing when she fell asleep.

Another little girl, somewhat older, is seated on a tabouret near the couch, and rests her fair head upon her mother's knee.

That young woman is my mother;—the children near her are my two elder sisters; the two younger sleep in the cradles.

My father, I have said, holds a book in his hand, from which he reads aloud. At this distant period I hear still the full, manly, strong and yet flexible sound of his voice, which swells in long sonorous periods only occasionally interrupted by the bustle of the wind against the window. My mother listens dreamily with her head slightly inclined. I myself, with my face lifted to my father's, and my arms supported upon his knee, drink in every word.

I anticipate the story, I devour the book whose pages unfold too slowly to satisfy my impatient imagination.

But what book is this? this first volume which heard thus at the outset of life teaches me truly what books may be, and opens to me the worlds of emotion, of love, and of dreams?

The book was the *Jerusalem Delivered*, translated by Le Brun, retaining all the majestic harmony of the Italian stanza, but freed by the exquisite taste of the translator from those affectations and false ornaments, which sometimes impair the manly simplicity of the verse of Tasso, as gold dust would tarnish the diamond, and which the breath of the Frenchman has blown away.

Tasso, thus read by my father, and heard by my mother with humid eyes, was the first poet who touched my imaginations and my heart. So he became for me one of that universal and immortal band in which, though chosen from all nations and ages, we recognize the kindred of our hearts, and the companions of our thoughts.

I have preserved those volumes with affectionate care. I have kept them through all those vicissitudes, to which changes of residence, death, successions, and divisions of property have exposed the family library. Sometimes when I visit Milly, I find myself alone in this room; then I reverently reopened these volumes. I read in a half suppressed voice some of those stanzas, and endeavour to recall my father's voice and to fancy my mother listening still, surrounded by her sleeping children.

The old emotion is still aroused by the verse of Tasso—the wind still sighs through the branches of the trees, and the vine stalks crackle still upon the hearth; but my father's voice is hushed, and my mother's seat is vacant;—for the cradles I see two graves whose sods are green upon a foreign hillside—and the book as I close it, is wet with my falling tears.

### BOOK IV.

#### CHAPTER I.

I have spoken to you of another scene of my childhood which remains deeply impressed on my memory, and I will describe it to you, because it will help to exhibit the nature of the education which I received from my mother.

It is an autumn day towards the close of September or the beginning of October. The mists, somewhat tempered by the autumnal sun, are floating around the summits of the mountains. Sometimes they rush into the bed of the valley, which they overflow, as a river swells from its channel in one night, sometimes they float over the meadows at the distance of a few feet from the earth, white and immoveable as the linen, which the peasant girls spread upon the grass, that it may bleach in the dew. At other times, separated by a light breeze, they roll from the sides of a range of hills and disclose glimpses of a magnificent perspective, fantastically illuminated by flashes of horizontal light, which pour from the half risen disk of the morning sun. In the village below it is still night. I arise. My clothing is coarse like that of the little peasants of the neighbourhood. I have neither shoes, stockings, nor hat. My dress consists of trowsers of coarse linen, a vest of shaggy blue cloth, a brown woolen cap, like that still worn by children among the mountains of Auvergne. Over all I throw a *sac* of linen which openes in front like a wallet with an immense pocket.

This pocket, like that of my comrades, contains a large piece of brown or barley bread, a cheese of goat's milk, hard as a flint, a little sous knife, whose awkward wooden handle contained also a steel fork with two long prongs. This fork serves the peasants in eating the bread, pork or cabbage, from the porringers in which their soup is served. Thus equipped I set off for the village square, which is near the church doors, and is shaded by two large walnut trees. There, the eight or ten little shepherds of Milly, of nearly the same age as myself, assemble every morning with their sheep and goats, and a few miserable cows, before starting for the mountains.

#### CHAPTER II.

We set off; we drive before us the common flock, whose long line follows, with unequal steps, the barren and winding paths of the first hills. Each in his turn follows the goats who occasionally escape by leaping over the hedges, and turns them back by throwing stones from his sling.

Having climbed the naked heights which overlook the village, and which we do not reach as we follow the flock, in less than an hour, we enter a mountain gorge, high and wide, where we no longer find either house, smoke or cultivation.

Both sides of this solitary hollow are overgrown with heath, violets, and the tall yellow broom plant; here and there some gigantic chestnut trees stretch their long and half naked branches. The leaves, discoloured by the early frosts, are shaken from the trees by the least breath of air. Some black rooks, who are perched upon the dry and dead branches of the oldest trees, fly croaking away as we approach. The great eagles and hawks fly higher in the sky over our heads and watch through the day the larks among the broom, and the little kids who shelter themselves near their dams.

Large masses of gray rocks, weather-stained and often covered with yellow moss, rise in groups from the earth on the steep declivities of the ravine.

Our flocks, now at liberty, scatter themselves at their pleasure through the broom.

As to ourselves, we select one of those huge rocks, whose bending summit forms part of an arch, and shelters from the rain a small extent of fine sand at its foot. There we establish ourselves. Then we go to collect faggots of dry heath, and fragments of the dry limbs which have fallen from the chestnut trees during the Summer. We have a tinder box and we soon kindle one of those shepherd's fires which are so picturesque when seen from afar from the vallies, or from the deck of some vessel sailing near the shore.

A little flame, clear and undulating, bursts through the dark gray and blue smoke of the green wood that we have heaped upon our fire, and which the wind whirls like the mane of a bounding steed. Then we open our bags and take out our bread and cheese, perhaps a few hard eggs, seasoned with coarse salt, and we slowly make our repast surrounded by our ruminating flocks. Sometimes one of us discovers at the far extremity of the branch of a chestnut, some of the husks containing fruit, which remained unobserved at harvest time; we arm our selves with our slings, and skilfully discharge a shower of stones, which does not fail to bring the fruit to our feet with the husks open; we proceed to roast them in the hot ashes of our hearth. If by chance we discover some forgotten potatoes in the furrows of a ploughed field, we hasten to put them too into a bed of ashes covered with coals, and eat them smoking hot, and sufficiently seasoned by the pride of discovery and the pleasure of larceny. At noon we collect our flocks and herds anew. They have been a long time lying in the sun on the grass heaped with dead leaves and broom. While the ascending sun has entirely dispersed the mists from the heights now bright and warm in his light, they have accumulated in the valleys and plains below. We can only see surging above the mists, the tops of the hills, the steeples of some elevated villages, and at the extremity of the horizon, the soft and shadowed snows of Mount Blanc, whose gigantic outline, sharp ridges, and approaching or retreating angles we see as if not far from us.

The flocks being collected, we take the way towards the real mountain.

We leave far behind us the first Alpine gorge where we have passed the morning. The chestnut trees disappear, and they are succeeded by brambles. The declivities become steeper as we advance, and are everywhere covered with fern, here and there variegated by the large blue bells and purple foxglove. Soon all these vanish, and we see on the mountain side only moss and rolling stones. There the flocks remain with only one or two shepherds. The others, and I among them, had discovered some days before near the loftiest peak of the highest summit, hard by a sheet of snow which is always white on the north side, melting only late in the warmest summers, an opening in the rock which doubtless terminated in some cavern. We have often seen the eagle fly towards the place, and the hardiest of us were now resolved to rob his nest. Armed with our sticks and our slings we commence the enterprise. We have provided for all contingencies, even for the darkness of the cavern, having been employed several days in preparing torches to illuminate it.

We have provided ourselves with young pine saplings from the forest. We have split each, through its whole length, into twenty or thirty parts, of the thickness of a line or two, united however at the lower extremity, which remain a solid handle by which we can carry it. We have bound the upper part at regular distances with iron wire, and for a long time we have had them put every day into the village oven as soon as the head was taken out, that they may be thoroughly dried.

These little trees, thus prepared in the oven, and impregnated with the rosin of the pine, form torches which burn slowly, but which nothing can extinguish, and which a breath of air blows into a flame of brilliant red light.

Each of us carried painfully upon his shoulder one of these torches.

Arrived at the foot of the rock, we circled round its base in order to find access to a winding entrance of the cavern which opened above our heads. We hoist ourselves painfully from rock to rock, and reach it at last with our hands and knees torn and bleeding.

The entrance roofed by an immense natural vault of blocks of stone, supported one against the other, is wide enough to shelter us all. It soon however became narrower, obstructed by piles of stone, over which it is necessary for us to climb, and then suddenly turning, it becomes a sort of natural stair way which leads rapidly to the night and darkness of the mountain recesses.

Here our hearts begin to fail us. We throw stones, and the sound of their distant fall returns to us accompanied by subterraneous echoes.

The bats rush from their holes, terrified by the noise, and their clammy wings brush against our faces, in their flight. We now light two or three of our torches. The boldest and tallest venture before, the rest of us follow. We creep cautiously at first, like the fox in his lurking place. The smoke of the torches is stifling, but nothing deterred we push on, and suddenly the vault swells higher and we find ourselves in one of those vast subterranean halls which are almost always found in our mountain caverns, and which enable them, so to speak, to breath the outer air.

At its extremity a small basin of clear water, reflects the light of our torches. Drops, brilliant as diamonds, trickle from the walls of the vault and fall at regular intervals into the basin, with that harmonious and plaintive tone which is always in the voice of waters, whether flowing in mountain springs or mighty seas.

Water is the element of sadness. *Super flumina Babylonis sedimus et flevimus.* Why? It is because water weeps with a weeping race. Children as we are, we too are moved by its voice.

Seated on the edge of the pool, we exult a long time over our discovery, although we have found neither eagles nor lions and although the rocks blackened in many places by the smoke of torches, convince us that we have not been the first to explore this mountain secret.

We bathe in the icy basin. We dip our bread in its waters, and forgetting even to explore the other branches of the cavern, we only bring ourselves to leave it, when day is done and the first stars are sparkling in the sky.

We wait until the shades of evening deepen into night—then we all kindle our torches at once, and bearing them aloft, we descend rapidly from summit to summit like shooting stars. We perform luminous evolutions upon the most conspicuous hills, where the distant villagers cannot fail to perceive us. We roll down upon our flocks like a torrent of fire, and drive them before us with shouts and songs. Reaching at length the last hill which overlooks the hamlet of Milly, we halt upon a green declivity, sure of being seen. There we lead the dance in circles, crossing each other's track, and holding high our blazing torches above our heads. Then we throw them half-burnt upon the grass, thus creating a single bonfire which we see burning slowly away as we seek our homes. Thus I passed my shepherd life, varied only by the changing seasons, seeking sometimes the mountains caverns, and sometimes the meadows whose waters sleep beneath the willows. Now we exercised ourselves in swimming in the mill sluices, and now in mounting and subduing the unbroken colts. Sometimes, armed with the herdsman's goad, I guided the oxen who drew the vintage car, loaded with grapes, or I trod the foaming vats with my companions. In the harvest time I laboured in the threshing floor with a flail proportioned to my childish strength. No man ever lived nearer to nature than I have done, nor imbibed earlier a love of rural life, the customs of the happy population who lead it, and the taste for those occupations simple, but as various as are modes of culture, places and seasons, which make of man, not as a soulless and ten-fingered machine, as do the monotonous labours of other employments, but a sentient, thinking, and loving being, in constant communication with nature which he breathes through every pore, and with the God of whose benefits he is always conscious.

#### CHAPTER III.

Stern, still, and lowly were the early impressions of my life. The first scenes upon which I gazed were not of a nature to colour or amplify the wings of my young imagination. It was only later, and by degrees, that the magnificent scenes of creation, seas, mountains, resplendent Alpine lakes, and monuments of human genius in great cities, greeted my eyes. At first I saw only what is seen by children in the most uncultivated hamlet, of a country quite destitute of remarkable features.

Perhaps it is the best way in order to enjoy thoroughly nature and the works of man, to begin with what is common and unpretending, and to come slowly and in proportion as the soul developes, to the pageants of our world. The eagle himself, destined to rise so high and see so far, begins his life in the crevices of the rock, and sees at first only the naked and unattractive interior of his nest.

The obscure village in which heaven appointed my birth, and to which the revolution and poverty have condemned my parents, offers nothing which can mark or decorate the native place of a painter and worshipper of the works of God.

## LITERARY IMPOSTURES OF WILLIAM HENRY IRELAND.

The Shakspeare forgeries of William Henry Ireland, form a curious, if not very edifying passage in the literary history of the last century. An imposture on a grander scale was never conceived or executed; and perhaps we may add, with all respect to the learned celebrities who were deceived by it, that dupes more easily satisfied, more credulous and unsuspecting, were never met with. It must be admitted that a very opportune period was chosen for the imposition; and, taking into consideration the youth of the individual by whom it was perpetrated—that he had not at the time attained his twentieth year—it must also be confessed that it was carried out with considerable cleverness and ingenuity.

William Henry Ireland was the son of a gentleman who is known as the author of several Picturesque Tours, and some illustrations of Hogarth—a man of considerable taste, and an ardent admirer of Shakspeare. He had been articled to an attorney, and having daily opportunities of inspecting ancient deeds and writings, he seems to have occupied his leisure, first in deciphering, and afterwards in copying and imitating them. Possessed of this dangerous talent, his father's reverence for the great English dramatist, and his own ambition for distinction, suggested to his mind the daring scheme of imposture by which he has rendered himself remarkable.

From an attentive examination of the authentic signatures of Shakspeare, he soon learned to imitate the character of his handwriting with facility; and from time to time presented his father with scraps of manuscript, to account for the possession of which, he invented a most romantic and improbable story. One of the earliest of these forgeries was "Shakspeare's Profession of Faith;" a document intended to prove that the great dramatist was a Protestant. The papers were soon shown to many learned individuals. Among others, they were inspected by Dr. Parr, and young Ireland could hardly repress his feelings of exultation when he heard that great man say to his father, in his presence, "Mr. Ireland, we have many fine things in our Church service, and our Litany abounds with beauties, but here is a man has distanced us all."

For a long time Ireland made almost daily additions to his pretended discoveries. Was it possible that his father had no suspicion of their origin, and that he was entirely deceived by the monstrous assertions of his clever, but unprincipled son? The appearance of the manuscript went far to prove their genuineness. The color of the ink—the water-marks in the paper, deceived the eye of the most practiced antiquaries. The precious relics were regarded with reverence and almost superstitious awe.

Mr. Boaden, a gentleman of great dramatic taste, in a pamphlet, written at a subsequent period to expose the fraud, was not ashamed to confess that "he first beheld the papers with a tremor of the purest delight, touched the invaluable relics with reverential respect, and deemed even existence dearer, as it gave him so refined a satisfaction." A number of literary gentlemen and patrons of literature met at Mr. Ireland's house, and voluntarily subscribed their names to the following document:—"We, whose names are hereunto subscribed, have, in the presence, and by the favor of Mr. Ireland, inspected the Shakespeare papers, and are convinced of their authenticity." Amongst the signatures are those of Dr. Parr, Herbert, Croft, Dr. Valpy, Henry James Pye, (poet-laureate,) and James Boswell, the biographer of Johnson. It is further stated that Mr. Boswell, previous to signing his name, fell upon his knees, and, in a tone of enthusiasm and exultation, thanked God that he had lived to witness the discovery, and exclaimed that he could now die in peace.

One of the ablest critics of the day, however, remained unconvinced. This was Mr. Malone, the ingenious and indefatigable editor of Shakspeare, who professed from the first a contemptuous disbelief in the so-called "discoveries," and intimated that he would not deign to notice them till they had been made public. He kept his word. When the famous documents were published, he addressed a letter to Lord Charlemont, in which he satisfactorily proved and exposed the fraud. It is rather amusing to find the great English advocate, Erskine, a devoted admirer and diligent reader of Shakspeare, and whose course of study and practice at the bar must have made him thoroughly conversant with all the rules of evidence, thus expressing himself with regard to these papers, and Mr. Malone's incredulity: "I went to-day to Ireland's, from curiosity, and having heard from several quarters that the new Shakspeare was a forgery, and having seen an advertisement from Malone on the subject, all I can say is, I am glad I am not the man who has undertaken to prove Mr. Malone's proposition; for I think I never saw such a body of evidence in my life to support the authenticity of any matter which rests upon high authority. I am quite sure a man would be laughed out of an English court of justice who attempted to maintain Malone's opinion in the teeth of every rule of probability acknowledged for ages as the standard for investigating truth.'

Believing himself possessed of a most invaluable treasure—in spite of the protestations of his son, who dreaded and foresaw the exposure of the fraud—Mr. Samuel Ireland determined on publishing the "discoveries," and in the year 1796 printed a large proportion of them in fine folio volume, under the title of "Miscellaneous papers and legal instruments under hand and seal of William Shakspeare, including the tragedy of King Lear, &c., in the possession of Samuel Ireland." A very slight examination of this volume would, it has been thought, have shown the transparency of the fraud. The orthgraphy adopted by Ireland was ludicrously inaccurate. The redundancy of consonants in nearly every word had a very grotesque appearance, and was by no means characteristic of the age of Shakspeare. Thus for "one gentleman," the orthography is "owne gennetellemanne." Although Shakspeare had "little Latin," he would never have committed the blunder of "Glosterre exitte," [for exit.] The concluding lines of Lear's denunciation of his daughter—

"That she may feel
How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is
To have a thankless child;"

were thus distorted:

"thatte she maye
Knowe sharpe and lyke a serpentes toothe it is
Toe have a thanklesse childe."

Without wishing unnecessarily, to multiply examples of this ridiculous orthography, we will quote the title of King Lear, as it appears in the volume. "The Tragedye of Kynge Leare isse fromme Masterre Holinshedde. I have in somme lyttle departedde fromme hymme, but thatte libbertye will notte I truste be blamedde by mye gentle readerres." "Gentle readers," we need not remind *our* readers, were not appealed to by the dramatists of Shakspeare's time, whose great object was to prevent their works from being printed, and thus getting into the hands of rival companies.

The mode in which Ireland accounted for the possession of the manuscript of Lear and other treasures is so curious, [perhaps the proper word would be impudent,] that we cannot help referring to it. He drew up a deed, in which he represented Shakspeare bequeathing them to one of his ancestors, an intimate friend of the poet, in acknowledgment of a special service he had rendered him. Divested of its grotesque orthography, the document, after the usual preamble, runs thus:

"Whereas, on or about the 3d day of the last month of August, having with my good friend Master William Henry Ireland and others, taken boat near unto my house aforesaid, we did propose going up the Thames, but those that were to conduct us being much too merry through liquor, they did upset our aforesaid barge. All but myself saved themselves by swimming, for though the water was deep, yet our being close nigh to shore made it little difficult for them knowing the aforesaid art. Master Ireland not seeing me did ask for me, but one of the company did answer that I was drowning; on the which he pulled off his jerkin and jumped in after me. With much pains he dragged me forth, I being then nearly dead, and so he did save my life; and for the which service I do hereby give him as followeth: first, my written play of Henry the Fourth, Henry the Fifth, King John, King Lear, as also my written play never printed, which I have named King Henry the Third," &c.

One would think that to have believed all this required a greater degree of credulity than usually falls to the lot of critics. An original letter, purporting to have been written to Shakspeare by Queen Elizabeth, is a forgery almost equally daring. We print it as it appears in the volume:—

"We didde receive youre prettye verses goode Masterre William through the hands of oure Lorde Chamberlayne ande wee doe complemente thee onne theyre greate excellence We shalle departe fromme Eondonn toe Hamptowne for the holydayes where we shalle expecte thee withe thye beste actorres thatte thou mayste playe before ourselfe toe amuse usse bee not slowe butte comme toe usse by Tuesdaye nexte asse the lorde Leicesterre withe be withe usse.

"ELIZABETH R."

"Thys letterre I dydde receyve fromme mye moste gracyouse Ladye Elizabethe ande I doe requeste itte maye bee kepte with alle care possyble.

"WM. SHAKSPEARE."

Amongst the papers, also, was an amatory epistle to Anne "Hatherreway," in which was enclosed a lock of the poet's hair. The letter is not long, but its affected grandiloquence is rather amusing. "I pray you," it commences, "perfume this my poor lock with thy balmy kisses, for then indeed shall kings themselves bow and pay homage to it. I do assure thee that no rude hand hath knotted it; thy Willy's alone hath done the work. Neither the gilded bauble that environs the head of majesty, no, nor honors most weighty, would give me half the joy as did this my little work for thee." There is also a paper of verses, inscribed to the same lady; the style of which, as will appear from a short specimen, is not quite worthy Shakspeare:

"Is there in heaven aught more rare
Than thou sweet nymph of Avon fair?
Is there on earth a man more true,
Than Willy Shakspeare is to you?"

The last document we shall notice, is a "Deed of trust to John Hemminge," drawn up by Shakspeare himself, who states in the preamble, as a reason for being his own attorney, that he has "found much wickedness among those of the law," and does not like "to leave matters at their will."

The most daring part of the imposition, however, remains to be told. On the 2nd of April, 1796, the play of *Vortigern and Rowena*, "from the pen of Shakspeare," was announced for representation at Drury Lane Theatre. Public excitement was at its height. As the evening approached, every avenue to the theatre was thronged with anxious crowds, eager to obtain admission. When the doors were opened, there was a furious rush, and thousands, it is said, were turned disappointed away. The play had been put on the stage with unexampled care. Mr. Kemble himself sustained the part of Vortigern. The imposition, however, was too palpable to deceive an intelligent audience, as will appear by the following characteristic account of the performance, which appeared in the *Times* newspaper of the 4th of April—"The first act, in every line of it, spoke itself a palpable forgery; but it was heard with candor. The second and third grew more intolerable; thus 'bad began, but worse remained behind.' In the fourth, 'rude murmurs, like the hollow-sounding surge, broke loudly forth.' In the fifth act, the opposition became seriously angry, and on Mr. Kemble repeating the insignificant line—

"I would this solemn mockery were o'er!"

he was not allowed to proceed for several minutes." An attempt was made to announce the play for repetition, but the unanimous voice of the public having proclaimed the imposture, it was wisely withdrawn.

The failure of *Vortigern* was a death-blow to the fraud; but it must occasion no slight surprise that such a barefaced forgery should have succeeded so far. Without possessing the genius of Chatterton, it cannot be denied that Ireland exhibited a large amount of misdirected ingenuity. At the time of the completion of *Vortigern*, he was only nineteen. The play was written and transcribed in secret, and at stolen intervals; and if we may take his own word, "he appeared in public at the same time as much as he could, in order to make the world believe he was a giddy, thoughtless youth, incapable of producing the papers."

The closing scene of the comedy—for so we may style the whole affair—may be readily anticipated. Gratified by the notoriety he had acquired, Ireland was easily induced to publish a full and free confession of his fraud. He hastened to take upon himself the whole responsibility, and anxiously endeavored to exculpate his father from any participation in the imposture. It must be confessed that circumstances seemed to warrant the suspicion that father and son were equally implicated, and even the latter's solemn declaration to the contrary, could not remove the impression that had been made on the public mind.

Mr. Samuel Ireland died in the year 1800, and it has been asserted that his days were shortened by the exposure of this shameful fraud, of which he had been made the dupe. The son subsequently published in his own name many plays, novels, and poems, which are now almost forgotten. His death is recorded in the Gentleman's Magazine, as having taken place on the 15th of April, 1835; and it may be further stated, that up to that period he had kept, and that he carried with him to the grave, the significant *soubriquet* of *Shakspeare* Ireland.—*Evening Post.*

*LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.*

DR. DAVID M. DAVIS, Woodstown, N. J.
CHARLES ATKINSON, Marian, Grant co. Ia.
J. MILLER M'KIM, Philadelphia, Pa.
AMARANCY PAINE, Providence, R. I.
PLINY SEXTON, Palmyra, "
J. C. HATHAWAY, Farmington, Ontario co. N. Y.
THOMAS McCLINTOCK, Waterloo,
S. HOWLAND, Sherwood's Corners, Cayuga co. N. Y.
S. STAMFORD ASHLEY, Oberlin, Ohio,
ROBERT F. WALLCUT, Boston, Mass.
JESSE HOLMES, New Lisbon, Columbiana co. Ohio,
K. G. THOMAS, Marlborough, Stark co.
ISAAC LEWIS, Short Creek, Harrison co. "
E. D. HUDSON, Springfield, Mass.
JAMES A. BURR, Ludlowville, N. Y.
ROBERT C. MARSHALL, Hiram, Portage co.
WILLIAM CRONK, Buffalo, N. Y.
GEORGE W. EASTON, Bridgewater, Mass.
DAVID K. COOK, Johnson's Creek, Niagara co. N. Y.
A. H. BIGELOW, Concord, Mass.
L. G. THOMAS, West Winfield, N. Y.
JOHN W. LYON, Hastings, Oswego co. N. Y.
MORRIS KINGSBURY, Fulton, "
CHARLES DOUGLASS, Jaughenwa, "
ALEX. FOREMAN, Pulaski, "
JOHN P. DICKINSON, Cleveland, "
SOLOMON PECK, Mexicoville, "
JOHN WILBUR, 2d. North Easton, Washington co. N. Y.
JONATHAN WILDE, Quaker Springs, Saratoga co. N. Y.